THE OLD TESTAMENT
IN THE GOSPEL OF LUKE

WITH EMPHASIS ON THE
INTERPRETATION OF
ISAIAH 61. 1-2

Volume II

by

Larrimore Clyde Crockett

A. B., Drury College, 1954

B. D., University of Chicago, 1957

Thesis

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of

Religious Studies at Brown University

June, 1966

CHAPTER IV

THE INTERPRETATION OF ELIJAH AND ISAIAH 61. 1-2 IN EARLY JEWISH EXEGETICAL TRADITIONS

Introduction

#161. Structure of the chapter. --In this chapter I am attempting to move behind the text of the Gospel to the level of some hypothetical tradition which Luke may have used. Thus far, certain indications in the text have pointed us toward the field of Jewish commentary upon Scripture. The methodological difficulties of this attempt have already been mentioned. From time to time in the course of what follows, the reader will be reminded of the possibilities and the limitations of this kind of study. This chapter roughly falls into two parts. The first part takes up a specific thesis, examines it minutely, and rejects it. This thesis is concerned with the possible lectionary background of Luke 4. 16-30. Such a background could be one way of explaining the content of the chapter and affirming some kind of underlying unity. In addition to its inherent problems, the lectionary theory, as set forth by Aileen Guilding, does not purport to explain the relationship between Luke 4 and 7, nor does it begin to deal with the many questions of interpretation which have thus far been raised in the course of our own research. Because of the tenuous nature of the thesis, it does not provide very many foundations upon which we can build. This part of chapter iv thus stands somewhat isolated. It may serve, however, to illustrate the complexity of this area of study and the pitfalls one can encounter. These difficulties do not excuse us from the necessity of carrying on this kind of study, however. In part two, we

will turn our attention to what might be called the main stream of Jewish midrashic tradition-Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, the Mishnah, Talmud, Midrashic commentaries, Targums and the like. Also included here will be certain less well-known works which are believed by scholars to contain important testimonies to early midrashic traditions. It is in this area that historical study similar to that carried on by Vermes will be particularly important. By this I mean that it will be necessary to begin with datable pre-Christian Jewish exegesis and subject it to careful analysis in order to be able to see possible pre-Christian midrashic traditions in documents which, in the form preserved to us, are post-Christian. (See sections #7 and #211. At the conclusion of this chapter, the significance of this research into Jewish traditions will be assessed and related to the themes and problems discussed thus far. Then in chapter v, bearing in mind some of the insights of this chapter, I will return to the interpretation of Luke 4. 16-30, and the larger question of the influence of Isaiah 61. 1 and related texts upon the Gospel as a whole.

Excursus: Luke 4. 16-30 and the Jewish Lectionary Cycle: A Word of Caution

#162. Introduction. --In her book, The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship, Aileen Guilding has presented an interpretation of Jesus' sermon at Nazareth (Luke 4. 16-30) which deserves careful examination because of it implications both for the nature of Jesus' preaching and for the milieu of the author of the Third Gospel. This interpretation involves two suggestions: (1) Jesus' sermon at Nazareth takes place at the end of the month of Tishri and reflects in its contents those Old Testament passages which were read at

that time of the year in the Palestinian Triennial Cycle; (2) Luke himself was intimately acquainted with this lectionary, as were his readers, and so in his own narrative of the sermon and the subsequent attempt on Jesus' life he is influenced in his vocabulary by words found in the pertinent Old Testament passages.[1] These suggestions, were they to prove to be sound enough to become foundation-stones for interpretation of the Gospels, would add to our present understanding of Jesus' use of the Old Testament precision that would allow us to extrapolate with some justification a fuller reconstruction of what Jesus probably said on a given occasion. Moreover it would cause us to look very critically at the general opinion that Luke, while acquainted with Palestinian sources, is writing for Gentiles who are unacquainted with Palestine and things Palestinian.[2]

#163. The lectionary theory. --This perspective on Luke is, of course, only ancillary to the main purpose of Guilding's book, which is to show that the structure and content of the Gospel of John is based upon the Triennial Lectionary Cycle. It is not my intention here to evaluate the book as a whole for we are concerned with Luke not John. However, the book has called forth two needs which this excursus attempts to meet. First of all, there is a need

---

[1]A. Guilding, The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1960), pp. 125-126, 230-231.

[2]E.g. A.H. McNeile, An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament (2nd ed. rev. by C.S.C. Williams; London: Clarendon Press, 1953), p. 40. Conzelmann's thesis is more radical: Luke was never in Palestine and had a very distorted view of its geography, (The Theology of St. Luke, p. 70). One could deduce from this that Luke was generally ignorant of Palestinian life, including synagogue worship.

for an objective summary of the evidence for and against the existence in New Testament times of a lectionary for both the law and the prophets. If this underlying thesis is tenuous, what is built upon it cannot become a foundation for further research. Miss Guilding has herself presented some of the arguments favorable to the thesis, [1] but her summary is not really adequate, particularly since there is more than one view among scholars as to where the weight of the evidence falls. The two most important studies of the Triennial Cycle--Adolf Büchler[2] and Jacob Mann[3]-- present us with somewhat conflicting views, particularly on the question of when in the year the cycle began. [4] Moreover, reviewers of Miss Guilding's book are divided on the question of the validity of her underlying thesis. N.H. Snaith[5] and F.F. Bruce[6] are favorably disposed toward it. Asher Finkel, in a recent analysis of

---

[1]A. Guilding, Fourth Gospel, pp. 6-44. Miss Guilding has devoted a chapter to the liturgical structure of the Pentateuch and the Psalms, a view suggested much earlier by Joseph Jacobs, "Triennial Cycle," Jewish Encyclopedia, XII, pp. 254-257. This argument will be illustrated below. Even if it is accepted, however, it still leaves the question of a prophetic lectionary in the early period undecided. See p. 241 below for a summary of Guilding's argument.

[2]"The Reading of the Law and Prophets in a Triennial Cycle," Jewish Quarterly Review, V (1893), pp. 420-468; VI (1894), pp. 1-73.

[3]The Bible As Read and Preached. Mann was a pupil of Büchler. His death in 1940 prevented the publication of Vol. II, which would be completed the Pentateuchal lessons, and Vol. III, which was to have included arguments concerning the origins of the lectionary cycle. This is a very unfortunate loss for work in this area.

[4]Mann favored a Tishri cycle while Büchler, followed by Guilding, favored a Nisan cycle. Cf. Mann, p. 6; Guilding, p. 17.

[5]Journal of Theological Studies, n.s. XII (1961), pp. 322-324.

[6]Journal of Semitic Studies, VII (1962), pp. 135-137.

Jesus' sermon at Nazareth, also makes positive use of Miss Guilding's work.[1] But on the other hand, R. E. Brown has strong misgivings about the thesis and its application in the Fourth Gospel.[2] Since many scholars have been content simply to state the uncertainty of the matter,[3] there seems to be a need for a brief and clear summary of the sources of our knowledge of the lectionary cycle and the evidence for it in the first century A. D. --especially in regard to the prophets. In what follows I will list the sources for our knowledge of the triennial lectionary cycle, present the main arguments for the existence of such a cycle (especially of the prophets) in the first century A. D., and finally, evaluate the use of this theory in the interpretation of Lk. 4. 16-30.[4]

#164. The sources. --The sources which Mann, Büchler, Guilding and others have drawn upon to reconstruct a triennial cycle may for convenience be classified into five categories:

(1) Tractate Megillah in the Mishnah, Tosephta and the Babylonian and Jerusalem Talmuds. Here is to be found some of our earliest information concerning regulations for the reading of Scriptures in the synagogue as well

---

[1]"Jesus' Sermon at Nazareth," p. 115. See also his summary of evidence in The Pharisees..., pp. 143-149 which came to my attention after this study had been written.

[2]Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXII (1960), pp. 259-261.

[3]E.g. A. Plummer, ICC on Luke, p. 120. Strack-Billerbeck, Kommentar, IV. 1, p. 169ff; Klostermann, Das Lukas Evangelium, p. 63.

[4]Let me express my indebtedness to Prof. Raphael Loewe for his many valuable insights and suggestions offered in the course of writing this particular section. The point of view taken here is, of course, completely the responsibility of the author.

as the set lections for special days.

(2) Midrashim. Among what Strack calls "expositional Midrashim"[1] there are found traditions which can prove to be important for a reconstruction of the early lectionary. The Tannaitic Midrashim Mekilta, Siphre and Siphra are early, but do not clearly reflect a lectionary background. Midrash Rabbah encompasses a diversity of material. Exodus R., Leviticus R., and Numbers R. from chapter 15 on, are clearly based on sedarim. Genesis Rabbah on the other hand, while probably containing earlier traditions, is not so organized and can be used to provide evidence for the existence of a lectionary only by linking it with later sources and inferring a common lectionary background. A pioneering study in this area was that of J. Theodor.[2]

(3) Homiletical Midrashim. The most important document in this category is Midrash Tanhuma, which is the basis for Mann's study.[3] Another source of homilies used by Mann is the Pesikta Rabbati. These sources are post-Talmudic in their present form.

(4) Lectionary Lists. There are several collections in this category, but one deserves special mention because of its extent. It is Bodleian Ms.

---

[1]Hermann L. Strack, Introduction to Talmud and Midrash (New York: Meridian Books and Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1959), p. 204.

[2]"Die Midrashim zum Pentateuch und der drei-jahrige palastinische Zyklus," Monatsschrift fur Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums, Vols. XXXIV-XXXVI (1885-1887).

[3]This Midrash (also called Yelammedenu) is preserved in two recensions: the first and more expanded is printed in several editions which are based on the printing at Mantua, 1563; the second is edited by Buber, Wilna, 1885.

2727 which is a list of sedarim and haphtaroth (i. e. lections from the prophets which "closed" the reading from the Law) used at the synagogue at Fustāt, Egypt. A curious feature of this synagogue is that it apparently observed the annual lectionary cycle and the triennial cycle simultaneously.[1] The document represents the practice of the 11th-12th centuries, but the traditions may be earlier. Fustāt was made capital of Muhammedan Egypt in A. D. 641 and had a very old Jewish community, an important segment of which came from Palestine. Other lists are to be found in the Adler Collection at The Jewish Theological Seminary, New York and the Taylor-Schechter Collection at Cambridge. In the latter is found the lectionary of Anan, the founder of the Karaites (ninth century on). The Karaite lectionary seems to preserve elements of the triennial cycle, but there are many problems involved in the use of this source.[2]

(5) Other Sources. Here may be gathered such disparate works as the Halakoth Pesukoth and Halakoth Gedoloth, used by Büchler for some of his material[3] and the Mahzor Yannai, one of Mann's sources. Yannai was one of the Palestinian synagogue poets (payyetanim) who lived in the seventh century and whose work reflects haphtaroth similar to those mentioned in the Genizah lists. These lections were first extracted by M. Zulay.[4] In

---

[1]Cf. Jacob Mann, The Jews in Egypt and in Palestine Under the Fatmid Caliphs (Oxford, 1920), Vol. II, pp. 221, 378; Vol. I, p. 36.

[2]Cf. Jacob Mann, "Anan's Liturgy and His Half-Yearly Cycle of the Reading of the Law," Journal of Jewish Lore and Philosophy, Vol. 1 (Oct. 1919), pp. 329-353 and idem, Texts and Studies in Jewish History and Literature (Cincinnati, 1931), Vol. II, pp. 296-297.

[3]Buchler, JQR, VI, p. 17.

[4]Piyyute Yannai (Berlin, 1938).

conclusion, the New Testament, Josephus, Philo and even the Pentateuch and the Psalter might be mentioned as sources but here the argument becomes circular. At best, these can only give supportive evidence for the existence of some kind of lectionary in the period before the destruction of the Second Temple; they tell us little about the content of the lectionary itself.

#165. Evaluation of sources. --Two comments on these sources: firstly most of them are considerably later than New Testament times and so questions of continuity of tradition or development and transformation in the intervening period must always be raised; secondly, these sources for the most part tell us only of the existence of links between sedarim (Pentateuchal lections) and haphtaroth (Prophetic lections): they do not tell us specifically on what sabbaths particular lections fell. This is true even of the lectionary lists. With at least two distinct possibilities as to when the cycle began, the dating of a specific lection becomes a very difficult historical problem. The possibility of variation from locality to locality makes the problem even more complex.

The Evidence for a Triennial Cycle of Law and Prophets in the First Century A. D.

#166. Introduction. --In this discussion it will always be necessary to sift the evidence to see just how much it tells us. If we can imagine a time when the closing reading from the Prophets was not fixed but chosen by the reader, then we must admit the possibility that the witness of an ancient text to the fact of the reading of Law and Prophets in the synagogue may reflect this less formal stage rather than a lectionary system. We must ask further

whether evidence that lections for feast days and special sabbaths were fixed relatively early can be used to argue for fixed lections on ordinary sabbaths. We have already stressed the necessity to keep evidence for the sedarim distinct from evidence for haphtaroth. Now it must be stressed that one must distinguish early evidence which links certain sedarim and haphtaroth from evidence which suggests that late lists of sedarim-haphtaroth reflect early usage. Does the possibility of correspondence between a few hints in early sources and the late lectionary lists justify one in reading the late lists back into the first century en masse? Or to put it another way, does the likelihood of there having been a lectionary cycle for law and prophets in the first century mean that we can actually reconstruct its content? These distinctions will be reflected in the organization of the following material. Evidence for the bare fact of the reading of the Law in the synagogue in the first century will be given first; then the earliest evidence for a triennial cycle of the Law. Next, evidence for a reading of the prophets will be collected and finally, and most important, evidence for a triennial cycle of prophetic readings.

Earliest Evidence for a Sabbath-Day Reading of the Law

#167. Josephus. --In Contra Apionem, ii, 175 we find:

> He (Moses) appointed the Law to be the most excellent and necessary form of instruction, ordaining not that it should be heard once for all, or twice, or on several occasions, but that every week men should desert their other occupations (all' hekastēs hebdomados tōn allōn ergōn aphemenous) and assemble to listen to the Law and to obtain a thorough and accurate knowledge of it.[1]

---

[1]The English translation is that of H. St. J. Thackery, in the Loeb edition of Josephus (Vol. I; London: William Heinemann, 1926).

This passage clearly indicates that in Josephus' time there was a weekly reading of the Law in the synagogue. It surely refers to at least the Sabbath-day reading, but may also include the week-day reading.[1] The fact that Josephus ascribes the institution of this custom to Moses is taken by Büchler to indicate that by Josephus' time it is already an old practice.[2]

#168. Philo. --An allusion to the practice of assembling to read the holy books and expound them, found in Philo (De. Som. ii, 127) has been taken to refer to the Sabbath-day reading of the law.[3] The despotic ruler of "Egypt,"[4] in an effort to argue that the Jews will break the Sabbath law in a state of emergency, asks

> (In a time of crisis) will you sit in your conventicles (sunagōgiois) and assemble your regular (eiōthota) assembly and read in security your holy books (hieras biblous), expounding any obscure point and in leisurely comfort discussing at length your ancestral philosophy?[5]

---

[1]It may be asked whether the phrase tōn allōn ergōn aphemenous may refer only to the week-day reading since work is prohibited on the Sabbath. If so, one might argue a minori ad maius that if the Monday and Thursday lessons are established in Josephus' time, the Sabbath lessons are probably an old custom and therefore likely to be fixed. In the context of Josephus' argument, however, it seems unlikely to me that he would refer only to the week-day lessons. The phrase can as well be taken as a reference to the fact that work is prohibited on the Sabbath and that on this day of rest men gather to hear the Law.

[2]Büchler, JQR, V, pp. 427-428.

[3]Guilding, Fourth Gospel, p. 6.

[4]The ruler to whom Philo refers might be Flaccus, or more likely, one of his predecessors. Cf. Colson's notes in the Loeb edition of Philo, Vol. V., p. 609.

[5]The translation is that of Colson in the Loeb edition.

#169. New Testament. --Much more pointed are two passages in the New Testament. In Acts 15. 21 we read

> For from early generations, Moses has had in every city those who preach him, for he is read every Sabbath in the synagogues. [1]

And in Acts 13. 14:

> And on the Sabbath day they went into the synagogue and sat down. After the reading of the Law and the Prophets, the rulers of the synagogue sent to them, saying, 'Brethren, if you have any word of exortation for the people, say it.'

These unquestionably first century sources clearly point to the practice of reading the Law in the synagogue on the Sabbath. They do not explicitly mention a lectionary cycle. However, when one turns to the Mishnah, one finds evidence of at least some fixed readings for certain days.

#170. Mishnah. --The key passage is Megillah 3. 4-6. Section four reads:

> If the first day of the month Adar falls on the Sabbath, they read the section in the law 'Shekels' (Ex. 30. 11-16).... On the second Sabbath of the month they read the section 'Remember what Amalek did' (Deut. 25. 17-19); on the third, the section of 'The Red Heifer' (Num. 19. 1-22); on the fourth, the section'This month shall be unto you' (Ex. 12. 1-20). On the fifth, they revert to the set order (likesidran). At all these times they break off (from the set order) in the reading of the Law: on the first days of the months, at the Feast of Dedication, at Purim, on days of fasting, and at Maamads and on the Day of Atonement. [2]

In sections five and six, specific lections are given for Passover, Pentacost, the New Year, the Day of Atonement, Tabernacles, Hanukkah and Purim. The Monday, Thursday and Sabbath afternoon lessons are said to be read

---

[1]This passage may refer to the reading of the Law in Greek in synagogues of the Diaspora. Cf. A. Harnack, Bible Reading in the Early Church (New York: G. P. Putnam's, 1912), pp. 57, 76f.

[2]The translation is that of Herbert Danby, The Mishnah (London: Oxford University Press, 1933), p. 205.

kesidran also--they are drawn from the reading for the following Sabbath. The passage ends by linking the whole institution of set readings for feasts with Leviticus 23. 44: "And Moses declared unto the children of Israel the set feasts of the Lord."

This passage is important in several respects. The expression kesidran seems to suggest an ordering of Pentateuchal readings for the Sabbaths of the year. The Mishnah does not tell us anything about the actual extent or content of this early lectionary. It only states some of the exceptions to it. Nor can we really tell from this passage whether the "set order" preceded the exceptions in historical development or whether as Büchler thought, the exceptional readings for Adar and the readings for the feasts are actually the beginning of lectionary development and only later did the ordinary Sabbaths have a fixed reading.[1] It is instructive to compare the Mishnah with the Tosephta and with its Gemara (BTal 29b) as well: whereas in Megillah 3. 4-6 there is no mention of the haphtarah, both the Tosephta and the Gemara indicate a haphtarah for each of the Pentateuchal passages

---

[1]Büchler, V, pp. 423ff. Büchler works on the principle that the fact that some aspects of the lectionary are ascribed by the tradition to Moses and other aspects to Ezra indicates that there was an awareness in ancient times of historical development in the lectionary, with some of its features of more recent origin than others. Sopherim xxi. 4 ascribes the four special Sabbath readings in Adar to Moses, while JTal Meg. iv. 2 ascribes the weekday lessons to Ezra; therefore the Adar readings stand early in the development, the weekday readings late. Büchler goes further and traces the origin of the special readings in Adar to the controversy between Pharisees and Sadducees recorded in the beginning of Megillath Taanith (cf. V, pp. 426-428, 452). Guilding (p. 241) takes the tradition as essentially accurate, for she sees the origins of the cycle much earlier than Büchler--perhaps as early as the time of Ezra.

mentioned in the Mishnah.[1] This suggests the possibility that prophetic readings were fixed sometime after the compilation of the Mishnah. Or, at the very least, it causes one to wonder why, if the prophetic lections were fixed in the time of the New Testament, the Mishnah makes no mention of them. The key passages in our earliest sources pointing to the custom of reading from the Law on the Sabbath have been briefly indicated. Now we can move one step further and ask to what extent there is evidence that these readings from the Law were arranged in a triennial lectionary cycle by the first century.

Earliest Evidence for a Triennial Cycle of the Law

#171. Introduction. --The first explicit mention of a triennial cycle in Palestine occurs in the Babylonian Talmud. Other more indirect testimony to such a cycle may be seen in the Mishnah, the dates given in Midrashic literature, and the Massoretic divisions of the Pentateuch. Some have argued that the structure of the Pentateuch and the dates which it assigns certain events already reflect the existence of a triennial cycle.

#172. Talmudic evidence. --In Megillah 29a there is a lengthy discussion of the Mishnaic regulations for the four special Sabbaths in Adar. Much of it centers on Sabbath Shekalim and the passage which is to be read on that Sabbath. Rab (who had been in Palestine) says that the reading for Sabbath Shekalim is Numbers 28. 2ff. Samuel says it is Exodus 30. 12ff. Arguments for and against the appropriateness of each of these passages are then given.

---

[1]See section #187 below.

The discussion is of interest not only because it makes mention of the triennial cycle, but because of others factors as well which illustrate the complexity of this subject. It will be helpful to point out the following facts: (1) Numbers 28. 11 is, according to Megillah iii. 6, the regular passage for the New Moon. (2) According to Megillath Taanith, Numbers 28. 4 was disputed by the Pharisees and the Sadducees in 79 B. C. and the victory of the Pharisees was celebrated by eight days of half-holidays at the beginning of Nisan. Büchler has conjectured that this event gave rise to the reading of the portion Shekalim and that in time this reading was assigned to the first Sabbath in Adar. [1] (3) If a triennial cycle was in existence alongside the four special Sabbaths in Adar, Numbers 28. 2ff (as well as Exodus 30. 12ff) would fall naturally at some point during the year. With these various factors in mind, we can turn to the passage in Megillah 29b itself, beginning with one of the objections raised against Numbers 28. 2ff:

> The following was then cited in objection: 'If it ⌈the New Moon of Adar⌉ falls on the portion next to it ⌈the portion of Shekalim⌉, whether before or after, they read it and repeat it.' Now this creates no difficulty for one who holds that 'When thou takest' (Exodus 30. 12ff) is read because ⌈the regular portion containing this passage⌉ falls about that time. But according to the one who says that 'My food which is presented to me' (Numbers 28. 2ff) is read--does ⌈the portion containing that passage⌉ fall about that time?-- Yes, for the people of Palestine who complete the reading of the Pentateuch in three years. [2]

The situation seems to be that in certai n years, depending on when the New Moon on Adar fell, the extraordinary portion of Shekalim was known to be read twice--once because it was the regular portion for the first Sabbath in

---

[1] Büchler, V, p. 426.

[2] The English translation is that of I. Epstein in the Soncino edition (London, 1938).

Adar and once for some other reason. The question was for which of the two possible Shekalim passages could one give reasons for its being read twice? The explanation for Exodus 30. 12ff was that it was not only portion of Shekalim, but it also was read regularly at that time of the year anyway, i. e. in the annual Babylonian lectionary cycle. But what about Numbers 28. 2ff? According to some it is the portion Shekalim, which would explain its being read once. One might expect that its second reading would be explained by its being the New Moon passage. But here the explanation is given that in the Palestinian triennial cycle, it normally falls in the beginning of Adar also. It is worth noting, however, that this works out only if one begins the triennial cycle in the month Tishri. [1] Thus while we have here a clear reference to the triennial cycle itself, the passage well illustrates the difficulty one has in reconstructing the exact nature of the cycle and understanding why certain passages are read at a certain time.

#173. Mishnaic evidence. --The Mishnah (Meg. iv. 2, 4) instructs that the Law is to be read on the Sabbath by seven persons, and that each person must read no less than three verses. Thus a reading of at least twenty-one verses would be normal. It is argued that with readings this short, a three-year cycle would be necessary to complete the Pentateuch, and thus these

---

[1]Primarily on the basis of this Talmudic passage, Elbogen, (Der judische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung (Leipzig, 1913), pp. 539-540, criticized Büchler's thesis that the cycle began in Nisan. Jacob Mann (Old Synagogue, p. 6) also believed Büchler to be in error not only in regard to the beginning of the cycle, but his whole conception of its origins and historical development. Unfortunately Mann did not live to publish his own thesis. A thorough re-examination of the problem is needed.

regulations indirectly witness to the existence of a triennial cycle.[1]

#174. Midrashic literature. --In the early Midrashic commentaries, (Mekilta, Siphra, Siphre) many events narrated in the Pentateuch are given a date. The Mekilta to Exodus 16. 35 says that Moses died on the 7th of Adar; in the same passage it is asserted that the exodus took place on Thursday, the 15th of Nisan.[2] Students of the lectionary have found that upon examination, these dates appear to reflect "lectionary time"--that is, they give the date upon which the Pentateuchal narrative was read in the lectionary cycle. Many of these dates can be harmonized with a triennial cycle. Unfortunately, there are conflicting midrashic traditions and it is impossible to harmonize all the dates into one consistent lectionary scheme.[3]

#175. The Massoretes. --The Massoretes, by means of certain sigla, divided the Old Testament into sections. One of these systems divides the

---

[1]A similar but more ambiguous argument from the Mishnah concerns the four New Years mentioned by Rosh Ha-Shanah i. 1: 1st Nisan, 1st Elul, 1st Tishri and 1st Shebat. Buchler (V, p. 443) points out what he admits may be only coincidence that in a triennial cycle beginning in Nisan, these dates correspond with the times at which a new book of the Pentateuch would be commenced. Miss Guilding (p. 13) also appeals to this evidence.

[2]Buchler, V, p. 433, and Jacob Z. Lauterbach, Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1949), II, pp. 126-127.

[3]Thus for example, this same Mekilta passage gives the 7th of Shebat as the date of Moses' death. Miss Guilding has sought to correct Buchler's analysis of this passage by reconstructing the regular cycle in such a way that Deuteronomy is ended at the end of Adar, not at the beginning, as Buchler thought. This of course means that the special portions which the Mishnah assigns to Adar must be regarded as a late development and not, as Buchler thought, the earliest stage of lectionary development. Miss Guilding's argument is ingenious, but unfortunately drives her to set aside the evidence of the Mishnah, which is the earliest specific evidence we have.

Pentateuch in 154 Sedarim (indicated in Kittel by the sign ס). This number would be appropriate for a reading of the Pentateuch in three years. Thus despite the fact that the Babylonian annual cycle (which divided the Pentateuch into 54 parashim) eventually prevailed throughout the Jewish world (except for isolated communities such as Fustāt, Egypt), the Palestinian triennial cycle can still be seen in the Masoretic divisions. [1]

#176. The internal evidence of the Pentateuch. --All of this is fairly impressive evidence for a triennial cycle. However when one becomes immersed in the detail of actually reconstructing the cycle, one immediately confronts very perplexing problems, some of which we have already at least hinted at. If one leaves it here, the only picture that emerges of the state of things in the first century is a relative chaos. To transcend this situation, and to provide a final argument for the antiquity and therefore the stability of the triennial cycle of the law in the first century, Miss Guilding appeals to the evidence of the Pentateuch itself:

> The school of writers who finally adapted the Pentateuch had chiefly in mind the cycle of the ecclesiastical year and the needs of public worship, perhaps the worship of the early synagogues, and it may well be that the Jewish tradition which traces to Ezra much that pertains to the reading of the Law and the arrangement of the liturgy is a reliable one.
> If this is so, then the triennial cycle is as old or older than the Pentateuch in its final form. It follows that by the first century A. D. the Pentateuchal lections of the triennial cycle must have been already old-established and fixed. [2]

---

[1]The precise number of sedarim varies from Ms. to Ms. but the number usually falls within the range of the possible number of Sabbaths in a three-year period. The number 175, mentioned by Sopherim (xvi. 10) and by the Jer. Tal (Sabbath, i. 1) is more difficult to explain. See Finkel's discussion of a possible Septennial Cycle, The Pharisees..., pp. 147f.

[2]Guilding, Jewish Worship, p. 44.

This theory, which was already suggested by Jacobs in his article on the triennial cycle is an intriguing one which cannot be discussed fully here, especially since our primary concern is with the prophetic lectionary. A quotation from Miss Guilding will illustrate the method:

> Most of the Pentateuchal dates fit a triennial cycle beginning in Nisan. Exodus 12, which would be read in Nisan of the second year of the cycle, describes the first Passover and is dated the first month of the year (Exodus 12. 2). A date in the second month is given in Exodus 16. 1; and Exodus 19. 1, the seder for Shabuoth, is appropriately dated 'in the third month'. The third year of the cycle would commence with Numbers 6. 22, and in Numbers 9, in a passage which interrupts the sequence, we find recorded a second institution of the Passover in the wilderness. Is it by accident that a passage dealing with the Passover has been inserted into the book of Numbers in just the right position to insure that it would be read at that festival?

And a little further on we read

> Exodus 16. 1 records that the children of Israel came to the wilderness of Sin on the 15th day of the second month, precisely the day on which the passage would be read.[1]

The argument is that certain dates in the text (months and days of the month) have been inserted into one of the final redactions of the Pentateuch as the result of the fact that the Pentateuch was already being read each Sabbath according to a triennial lectionary cycle, and the dates represent the time of the year when the passage normally was read. A considerable amount of evidence is brought forward to support this thesis, some of which is certainly striking. Again, there are many problems involved in harmonizing the dates

---

[1] Jewish Worship, p. 27. It might be pointed out that whereas here, Exodus 16. 1 is said to fall "precisely" on the 15th day of Iyyar, later on (page 62) this same passage is brought into the orbit of Passover lections which are said to lie behind the discourse in John 6. As for the connection of Exodus 19. 1 with Pentecost, cf. Jacob Mann, Old Synagogue, pp. 453ff., for the conflicting traditions.

with a reconstruction of the cycle, and quite a bit of ingenuity and not a little flexibility is needed to make things work out. Even if the thesis could be accepted as strongly suggesting the antiquity of a Pentateuchal lectionary, it would still have to be asked whether the prophetic lectionary could be as old. It is clear at the outset that the prophetic books present a different situation: at no time have they been read consecutively. The haphtarah was a passage selected from the prophetic books because of its appropriateness to close the reading from the Torah.[1] Thus the selection of haphtaroth always had a midrashic basis, and this in itself suggests that the historical development of the prophetic lections has its own peculiar character and in addition makes the reconstruction of the ancient prophetic lectionary an inherently more problematic task. Since Miss Guilding's interpretation of the Luke 4, as well as John, makes heavy use of a reconstructed prophetic lectionary, we need now to discuss this aspect of the lectionary problem in its own right.

Earliest Evidence for a Sabbath-day Reading of the Prophets

#177. Luke 4. 16-17. --The New Testament (Luke 4. 16-17; Acts 13. 15, 27) is the only fully explicit first century source. Philo and Josephus do not help us and the Mishnah's evidence is less explicit than in the case of the reading of the law.

Luke 4. 16-17 reads:

> καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς Ναζαρὰ, οὗ ἦν τεθραμμένος, καὶ εἰσῆλθεν κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων εἰς τὴν συναγωγήν, καὶ ἀνέστη ἀναγνῶναι. καὶ ἐπεδόθη αὐτῷ βιβλίον τοῦ προφήτου Ἡσαΐου, καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ βιβλίον εὗρεν τὸν τόπον οὗ ἦν γεγραμμένον·

---

[1]BTal. Meg. 29b.

As we have seen, the historical reliability as well as the literary integrity of the entire passage (Luke 4. 16-30) has been questioned by some Christian scholars. [1] But there are no good reasons for doubting that these verses describe a typical event, if not an actual one. Assuming, then, that the language does reflect the actual practice of a Palestinian synagogue in Jesus' time, how much does this text really tell us? Scholars have come to differing conclusions as to the exact meaning of these words. Abrahams[2] and Guilding[3] take this text as evidence that Is. 61. 1-2 in Jesus' time was already a fixed lesson for the day and was handed to Jesus to be read. Thus the text stresses that the book of Isaiah was given to Jesus; he did not select it. Abraham presses the distinction between anoixsas (which means opening to a place already prepared) and anaptuxsas (which would be the more precise term for unrolling the scroll, as ptuxsas is the term actually used to describe rolling it up again after use). However some Mss. do use the term anaptuxsas (Aleph, Koine, D, Theta and others). But it is doubtful that the terms can be so pressed. The majority of interpreters see in this text an indication that the reader had a more-or-less free hand in choosing the lection to be read. Strack-Billerbeck, [4] Schmid, [5] Manson, [6] and Plummer[7]

---

[1]See sections #83-96 above.

[2]Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels (Cambridge: University Press, 1917), I, p. 8.

[3]Jewish Worship, p. 21f. [4]Kommentar, IV/1, p. 169f.

[5]Das Evangelium Nach Lukas (Regensburg, 1960), p. 111.

[6]The Gospel of Luke (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930), p. 41.

[7]ICC on Luke, p. 120.

decide that lections were not yet fixed and that the word heuren indicates that Jesus looked for what he wanted and found it. Klosterman[1] and Grundmann[2] suggest that Luke sees something almost miraculous, or at least wonderful, in the fact that Jesus "found" this particular passage which is so appropriate for his ministry. To the present writer, the simplest sense of the passage seems to be that the custodian of the synagogue selected the book of Isaiah for the prophetic reading and Jesus found the passage which he wanted to read. But for the question of the degree to which the prophetic lections are fixed at this time, the passage is really too ambiguous to decide anything. It certainly indicates that the prophets were read, but it need not necessarily imply that they were read every Sabbath or that the readings were fixed into a lectionary cycle.

#178. Acts 13. 15, 27ff.--Acts 13. 14ff, cited above in connection with the reading of the law, also mentions the prophets. In verse 27 of the chapter it is stated by Paul that the people of Jerusalem did not "understand the utterances of the prophets which are read every sabbath." If this can be taken as indicating the practices of synagogues generally, then clearly the reading of a haphtarah is customary in the first century. Later we will discuss Miss Guilding's analysis of this passage in Acts where she sees evidence that Paul has linked Old Testament passages which are also linked in the later lists of sedarim and haphtaroth.

#179. Mishnah.--The Mishnah (Meg. iv. 1-5) mentions a reading from

---

[1]Das Lukasevangelium, p. 63.

[2]Evangelium nach Lukas, p. 120.

the prophets:

> On a Festival day the Law is read by five, the Day of Atonement by six, and on the Sabbath by seven. They may not subtract from them but they may add to them, and they close with a reading from the Prophets.
> He that reads in the Law may not read less than three verses; he may not read to the interpreter more than one verse or, in a reading from the Prophets, three verses....They may leave out verses in the Prophets but not in the Law.

#180. The question of the content of the prophetic lectionary. --These statements in the New Testament and the Mishnah taken together establish quite definitely that a closing reading from the prophets was customary every Sabbath and that by the end of the second century and probably earlier regulations for this reading had been laid down. But these sources tell us nothing of the actual content of the lectionary. The Mishnah does not speak of a "set order" of prophetic lections as it did of the Law. For information about the readings themselves we must turn to later sources. [1] Tosephta, Megillah iv,

---

[1]At this point mention may be made of the paragraph divisions and marginal markings in the Dead Sea Isaiah Scroll. If these could be shown to clearly point to a liturgical use of the Scroll, the case for a pre-Christian lectionary of the Prophets would be strengthened. It is probably too early to say precisely what their significance is. Hans Bardtke "Die Parascheneinteilung der Jesajarolle I von Qumran," in Festschrift Franz Dornseiff, ed. Horst Kusch (Leipzig: Veb Bibliographisches Institut, 1953), pp. 33-75 has found that two thirds of the sections in DSJa (indicated by gaps in the text) are also to be found in the tradition (MT, LXX). The main difference between the DSJa divisions and the Massoretic is that the latter tend to make larger paragraphs. Bardtke leaves fairly general the reason for the divisions--they reflect "theological, liturgical or exegetical needs" (p. 74). However he does emphasize the great interest of the community in this book and suggests that "es wäre zu erwarten, dass ein so starkes theologisches Auslegungsinteresse gegenüber dem Text sich auch in seiner graphischen Gliederung bemerkbar machte und somit erhebliche Abweichungen von herkömmlichen Parascheneinteilung bedingte. Diese Erwartung würde auf der Voraussetzung beruhen, dass die Schriftrollen der Qumran-Gruppe in ihren gottesdienstlichen Versammlungen benutzt worden sind und in ihrer graphischen Gliederung dem Vorleser und Ausleger Hilfen für Auge und Gedächtnis boten." (p. 39). As for marginal markings, interest centers on the X-marks, for which various explanations have been given. Cf. W.H. Brownlee, The Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls

designates haphtaroth for the four special Sabbaths in Adar which correspond to those indicated for the same Sabbaths in the Gemara. Tractate Sopherim also provides much information concerning specific haphtaroth. It is clear from the Talmud (BTal. Meg. 23a) that the prophetic readings are regulated in a way similar to the sedarim: "the haphtarah from the Prophet should read not less than twenty-one verses, corresponding to those read by the seven who have read in the Torah." The Homiletical Midrashim, the liturgy of the Karaites and the various lectionary lists from the middle ages, especially the lectionary of the Fustât synagogue, give us full information on a triennial cycle of the Prophets. The critical question is whether there are clues in the early sources which indicate that the lectionary as we know it from later sources was already in existence. Such clues have been seen. Jacob Mann found them in passages ascribed to the first century rabbis preserved in the Genesis Rabbah and Exodus Rabbah. Miss Guilding has found them in some of the sermons of the New Testament, particularly Acts 13. 14ff and John 6. This evidence deserves our closer examination.

Evidence for a Triennial Cycle of Prophetic Readings in the First Century

#181. Mann's study of the homilies. --To understand the evidence which Mann brings forward it is necessary first to outline the main thesis of his study and his methodology. He has examined thoroughly the structure of the

---

for the Bible With Special Attention to the Book of Isaiah (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), pp. 178-179 and the bibliography given there. Some have understood the X as Greek Chi and standing for Christos--thus marking Messianic prophecies. Others have seen it as standing for chrestos (excellent) and marking passages of interest. It is conceivable that the markings have liturgical origins.

homiletical Midrashim, especially Midrash Tanhuma.[1] These homilies have a characteristic structure: they open with the formula yelammedenu rabbenu --"Let our master teach us"--e. g. "how many kinds of clean animals there are in the world." The opening formula is answered with an halakic pronouncement. There then follows a series of proems (called petiḥtas) which amount to a catena of Scriptural passages drawn mainly from the Hagiographa. There follows the homily proper--an exposition of the lection for the day. The homilies follow the lectionary cycle. A typical homily closes with words of comfort and Messianic hope. It was Mann's thesis that the actual structure of these homilies was governed throughout by the haphtarah--the prophetic lection which is never explicitly mentioned but which is actually in the mind of the homilist at all times. To be specific, (1) the halakic portion is determined by a verbal clue found within the compass of the haphtarah; (2) the petiḥta normally agrees with a word or phrase in the haphtarah, usually in the first line; (3) the seder also tallies verbally with the haphtarah, usually with the first line. The agreement can be slight--only one word, or extensive--several words, a phrase or an entire theme; (4) the actual content of the homily proper reflects the wording not only of the seder but also (and in some cases especially) the haphtarah. This fact led some of the older interpreters of these homilies to remark that the homily often seemed to have nothing to do with the reading for the day! Mann shows, however, that the homily is usually dependent upon the prophetic passage. Even those portions of the

---

[1]Named after R. Tanḥuma of the fourth century who is mentioned frequently in it. Cf. G. F. Moore, Judaism, I, p. 170.

haphtarah which are skipped (cf. Mishnah, Meg. 4.4, cited above, page 225) in the reading for the day are drawn upon in the homily--a principle of exposition which, were it used in New Testament times could be of importance for the interpretation of the sermons in Acts and similar passages.[1] The basic intention of the homilist, according to Mann, was to demonstrate the unity of the three divisions of the Bible and the unity of Written and Oral Law. This was accomplished by a complex interweaving of seder (law), haphtarah (prophets), petihta (Writings) and halakah (Oral Law). It must be said that much of this thesis rests upon Mann's inference as to what the actual haphtarah underlying the homily really was, for in many cases the haphtarah indicated by the lists as the one designated for a given seder did not actually underly the homily. In most cases Mann was able to find a prophetic passage which seemed to fit the conditions and his deduction was that the lists are late and that the homilies give us haphtaroth which are earlier than those in the extant lists. This in itself points to change and development in the actual content of the prophetic lectionary.

#182. The haphtarah to Genesis 14. --With Mann's general thesis in mind, let us turn to the evidence which seems to point to an early fixing of the prophetic readings. The sedarim involved are Genesis 14 and Exodus 21. 1. There are three sources for the haphtarah to Genesis 14: the Genizah lists, the Midrashic tradition which links passages from Torah and Prophets, and the Tanhuma homilies. The lists and the Midrashic tradition point to Isaiah 41:2-13 as the haphtarah to Genesis 14. But the Tanhuma homily

---

[1]See sections #12 and #26.

gives mixed evidence. The prophetic passage which appears, upon analysis, to underly the homily proper is Zecharaiah 9. 10. But the petihta, Psalm 37. 14-15, tallies verbally not with Zech. 9. 10 but with Is. 41:2-13 (Ps. 37. 14 --hereb--qashtam; Is. 41. 2--harbo--qashto). There is also a close verbal connection between Isaiah 41 and Genesis 14: (1) each have the word goyim in the first verse; (2) Abraham is mentioned in each; (3) in other homilies the phrase mi he' ir mimmizrah sedeq is interpreted by the device of 'al tiqre ha'ir ella ha'or to refer to Abraham, who illumined the world with his righteousness, [1] and general Midrashic tradition sees in the victorious leader raised up by God in Is. 41. 2 a reference to Abraham's defeat of the four kings in Genesis 14. Thus it seems assured that it is Is. 41. 2-13 which is haphtarah to Genesis 14 at the earlier stage and Zech. 9. 10 is a later development. [2] The important point in this analysis is that the petihta -- Ps. 37:14-15, is linked with Genesis 14 because it tallies with Is. 41. 2. It is argued then that wherever we find Genesis 14 in conjunction with Ps. 37. 14-15, Is. 41. 2ff must be in the background even if it is not explicitly mentioned. And as it happens, Genesis Rabbah 42. 1 does link Genesis 14 with Ps. 37. 14 in a narrative which is associated with a first century rabbi--R. Eliezer b. Hyrcanus.

#183. The link in an early tradition. --The passage relates how Eliezer left his father's farm to study under R. Johanan b. Zakkai. His

---

[1]Mann, Old Synagogue, p. 63.

[2]In this instance Mann departs from his usual deduction in his conclusion that the lists preserve an early tradition and the homily a late one.

father finally comes to disinherit him and the passage continues:

> he found him sitting and lecturing with the greatest of the land before him: Ben Zizzith Hekeseth, Nikodemon ben Gurion and Ben Kalba Shabua. He was expounding this verse: 'The wicked have drawn out the sword and bent the bow' (Ps. 37. 14); this alludes to Amraphel and his companions (Gen. 14. 1).[1]

In a parallel account of this incident in Buber's edition of the Tanhuma homilies, the narrative is expanded in that it states that the father found R. Eliezer on the sabbath in his master's Beth Ha-Midrash delivering a sermon on these texts. Mann makes note of this:

> In Genesis Rabbah the account is curtailed... Here the preaching on the sabbath is not mentioned, but the verse (Ps. 37. 14) of the Petihta tallies so well with Is. 42. 2: yitten ke'afar harbo keqash nidaf qashto, as to render obvious the conclusion of the homily being a Petihta of a sermon to our Seder and Haphtarah, fortified as the conclusion is by the parallel account in Tanhuma.[2]

Mann also sees no reason for doubting the reliability of the ascription of this incident to R. Eliezer who was active before 70 A. D.

#184. Summary. --To summarize, then, the relevance of these passages for the existence of set prophetic readings in the first century rests on three assumptions: (1) the reliability of the ascription of this narrative to R. Eliezer's time; (2) the validity of Mann's thesis that the petihta must reflect an underlying haphtarah and is not chosen simply for its similarity to the passage from the Torah; (3) the reliability of the information found in Tanhuma, but not in Genesis Rabbah, that this incident took place on the sabbath. This last point is important because if this incident has its context in a week-day

---

[1]Translation by H. Freedman, Midrash Rabbah: Genesis I (London: Soncino Press, 1939), p. 340. Cf. J. Theodor and H. Albeck, Genesis Rabbah (Berlin, 1912-1931), pp. 397-398.

[2]Mann, Old Synagogue, p. 106, note 102.

discourse in the master's school, then the necessity to presuppose the haphtarah as underlying the petihta is not as strong. Despite this qualification, Mann does appear to have uncovered an important piece of evidence and his argument is convincing. Just how much can be implied from this evidence will be discussed below.

#185. Another early link?--The second passage is not as convincing. We are dealing here with Exodus 21. 1 and its haphtarah, Is. 56. 1. There are three petihtas in Tanhuma: Ps. 99. 4, Prov. 29. 4 and Ps. 147. 20. The passage in Exodus Rabbath 30. 9, dealing with Exodus 21. 1 ("Now these are the ordinances...) reads as follows:

> It is written, "He that declareth His word unto Jacob," (Ps. 147. 19);--these are the (Ten) Commandments; "His statutes and ordinances unto Israel"--(Ibid)--these are the ordinances. The ways of God differ from those of men; whereas man directs others to do a thing whilst he does nothing, God only tells Israel to do and observe those things which He himself does. It is related of Rabban Gamaliel, R. Joshua, R. Eliezer b. Azariah and R. Akiba that they went to Rome and taught there: The ways of God are not those of man, who makes a decree enjoining others to do a thing whilst he does nothing; God not being so. There happened to be a sectarian (min) there, who accosted them as they were going out with the taunt: "Your words are only falsehood. Did you not say that God says a thing and fulfills it? Then why does he not observe the Sabbath?' (Note--by means of winds and storms God is guilty of carrying things on the Sabbath). They replied, 'Wretch! Is not a man permitted to carry on the Sabbath in his own courtyard?' He replied, 'Yes.' Whereupon they said to him: 'Both the higher and the lower regions are the courtyard of God, as it says, 'The whole earth is full of his glory,' (Is. 6. 3); and even if a man carries a distance of his own height, does he transgress?' The other agreed. 'Then' they said, 'as it is written, 'Do I not fill heaven and earth?' (Jer. 23. 24). [1]

Mann's argument is that the question of the Min concerning the sabbath must be a reference to the haphtarah which underlies this discourse--Is. 56. 1ff--

---

[1]Translation by S. M. Lehrman, Exodus Rabbah (London: Soncino Press, 1939), III, p. 355.

"Blessed is the man who keeps the sabbath," and verse 4--"to the eunuchs who keep my sabbaths..." Since these Rabbis visited Rome in 95 A.D., we have another instance of the triennial cycle being employed in the first century.[1]

#186. Critique. --There are several difficulties in this argument. (1) It is not so clear here that the haphtarah is necessary to explain the passage from the Psalm. The Psalm seems much more closely related to the passage in Exodus 21--which is a recitation of laws. (2) There is no mention in the Exodus Rabbah of this incident taking place on the sabbath. (3) While it is true that there is a connection between the question asked by the Min and the verses in Is. 56, is it not also true that Psalm 147 has been interpreted here as referring in part to the Ten Commandments--and would not this, plus the very obvious nature of the case chosen by the sectarian, be enough to explain his question without resorting to an underlying haphtarah? (4) Finally, there are references to other prophetic passages here--Is. 6 and Jer. 23--which have nothing to do with the lectionary cycle. Thus, as a whole, this evidence does not appear as convincing as the former.

#187. The difficulty of distinguishing the lectionary from a midrashic tradition. --Let it be granted nevertheless that Mann has uncovered here links between the Torah and the Prophets and the Writings which are preserved in two independent sources--Midrash Rabbah and the Tanhuma homilies. Does this point to the existence of the triennial cycle of the prophets in the first century? At this point we may recall the Talmudic passage mentioned earlier

---

[1]Mann, Old Synagogue, p. 472.

(#176) that speaks of the appropriateness of the haphtarah to the seder. The passage (BTal. Meg. 29b) reads:

> When the New Moon of Adar falls on Sabbath, the portion of Shekalim is read, and the chapter of Jehoiada the Priest (II Kings 12) is read as haphtarah. Now according to the one who says 'When thou takest' (Ex. 30. 12) should be said there is a good reason for reading Jehoiada the Priest as haphtarah, because it is similar in subject, as it is written there, 'the money of the persons for whom each man is rated.' But according to the one who says that 'My food which is presented to me' (Numbers 28. 2) is read, is there any similarity? There is, on the basis of R. Tabi's dictum. [1]

Thus similarity in subject (to the seder) is an important criterion for the haphtarah, and in some cases this similarity must be brought out by a particular rabbinic exegesis. This procedure of linking haphtaroth with sedarim on the basis of their appropriateness is confirmed by a study of other early haphtaroth: e. g. those mentioned by the Tosefta as designated for the four special Sabbaths in Adar. We have already noted the connection between Ex. 30. 12ff and II Kings 12. 3 (12. 9 in English Bible)--the bringing of money to the temple. The haphtarah to Deut. 25. 17-19 ('Remember what Amalek did..') is I Sam. 15. 2-9 ('I will punish what Amalek did..'); with Numbers 19. 1-22 (purification rites) is put Ezekiel 36. 25f ('I will sprinkle clean water upon you'); Exodus 12. 1-20 has as its haphtarah Ezekiel 45. 18--both passages beginning with mention of the first month. [2] Büchler points out that "many of the haphtaras... were originally selected on account of a Midrashic connection set up between the prophet portions and their respective Pentateuch passages, "[3]

---

[1]Translation by M. Simon (London: Soncino Press, 1938), p. 180.

[2]Tosefta, Meg. iv. Cf. G. F. Moore, Judaism, I, p. 300.

[3]Büchler, VI, p. 59.

and that "the historical writings, in consequence of their subject matter, were very useful in the choice of historical allusions to similar events narrated in the Pentateuch."[1] The significance of this is that it strongly suggests that the establishment of a triennial cycle of Law and Prophets did not create connections between passages but made use of such connections already uncovered by Midrashic exegesis. This possible overlapping of the triennial cycle with Midrashic traditions brings another element of uncertainty into the reconstruction of the cycle in the first century. When Mann points out a correspondence between the Tanhuma homilies and first century Midrashim, he is not necessarily proving the existence of the triennial cycle in the first century. He may rather be tracing into the first century an exegetical tradition which has linked Law, Prophets and Writings and is preserved in several different sources. It seems important to point out, therefore, that many New Testament passages which Miss Guilding has interpreted by reference to a reconstructed lectionary cycle may be equally and perhaps more simply explicable in terms of acquaintance on the part of Jesus or the authors of the Gospels with Jewish exegetical traditions. The distinction has implications for the methodology with which one approaches the New Testament as well as for the way in which one understands the historical background of individual books. When we turn to Miss Guilding's analysis of specific New Testament passages which appear to make connections between passages that are linked in later lectionary sources, we encounter similar methological problems.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 38.

#188. Acts 13.--Paul's sermon at Antioch in Pisidia is well-known for its extensive use of the Old Testament.[1] If this sermon could be shown to be based upon the triennial lectionary cycle, this would have important implications for our understanding of the construction of the speeches in Acts and for the nature of Luke's sources.[2] In verse 18 of this passage there is a clear allusion to Deut. 1.31: etropophorēsen autous en tē erēmō; Deut 1.31 (LXX): kai en tē erēmō tautē hēn eidete hōs etrophophorēsen se kurios ho theos... According to later lectionary sources (see below) the haphtarah to Deut. 1.31 is Jeremiah 30.4. Just how far the prophetic lection extended is not clear, but it may have included verse 9: weavdu eth...dawid malkam asher aqim lahem. Miss Guilding sees in Acts 13.22 an allusion to Jeremiah 30.9: ēgeiran ton David autois eis basilea. Her conclusion is that the late lectionary sources tally with the practice of the synagogue at Antioch in Paul's time and his sermon made use of the readings for the day.[3]

#189. Critique.--The problems in this argument are mainly the identification of the haphtarah for Deut. 1 and the identification of verse 22 as an allusion to Jer. 30.9. Büchler notes that in Deuteronomy our usual sources for haphtaroth fail us, and one must resort to the Yemenite ritual and a South Italian list of haphtaroth to make up the deficiency.[4] It is according to these

---

[1]Cf. the article by O. Glombitza, New Testament Studies, V (1959), pp. 306-317.

[2]Compare M. Dibelius, "The Speeches in Acts and Ancient Historiography," in Studies in the Acts of the Apostles (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956).

[3]Guilding, Jewish Worship, p. 7.

[4]Büchler, VI, p. 37.

lists that Jeremiah 30. 4 is the haphtarah to Deut. 1. Both these sources follow an Annual Cycle. On the other hand, according to Deuteronomy Rabbah (to Deut. 2. 31), the haphtarah for Deut. 1 would be Amos 2. 9. It is not certain, then, that Jeremiah 30. 9 is the haphtarah to Deut. 1 in the early period. But even if it were, did it extend to verse 9? There is no indication in the sources as to its length and early haphtaroth can be as short as one or two verses. Finally, is Acts 14. 22 really an allusion to Jer. 30. 9? There are countless places in the OT which speak of God "raising up" someone--i. e. bringing them onto the scene. The expression is so common that one might not need to understand any specific verse in the OT behind Acts 14. 22, although it is true that Jer. 30. 9 is the only OT passage which speaks specifically of "raising up David." One might mention also the fact that there are many other allusions to the OT in this sermon which do not appear to harmonize with any lectionary cycle, and thus there is more to the composition of the sermon than a reflection on the readings for the day. But if that is true, then the conjunction of Deut. 1 and a possible allusion to Jer. 30. 9 may not be more than coincidence.

#190. John 6. --This discourse given by Jesus in the synagogue at Capernaum (verse 59) is put forward by Miss Guilding as a prime example of an elaborate interweaving of themes suggested by the readings which were associated with a certain time of year in the lectionary cycle:

> Frequently in the New Testament a quotation is made from the Pentateuch followed by one from the prophets. Such a pair of quotations turn out to be seder and haphtarah according to the reconstruction of the haphtaroth of the triennial cycle made from Genizah lists, Midrashim, etc. Thus for example in John 6 the sermon preached by our Lord in the synagogue at Capernaum at Passovertime or shortly afterwards proves on examination to be an exposition of the themes of the sedarim of the triennial

> cycle for the last sabbath in Nisan or the first in Iyyar, Genesis 6 (sic), Exodus 16 and Numbers 11. Now the haphtaroth to Genesis 6 was Isaiah 54. 9ff. But verse 14 of this haphtarah was actually quoted by our Lord: thus his sermon was based not merely on Passover themes, but on Passover lections, including the haphtarah. And this is no isolated instance; the phenomenon occurs so frequently that it cannot easily be put down to coincidence. [1]

As an aid to the comprehension of Miss Guilding's procedure, we will reproduce here that section of the Triennial Cycle which she thinks is relevant to John 6:[2]

	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year
1st Nisan	Gen. 1. 1 Is. 42. 5 Is. 65. 17-25	Ex. 11. 1 Micah 7. 15-20	Num. 6. 22 ?
2nd Nisan (Passover)	Gen. 2. 4 Is. 51. 6-16	Ex. 12. 29 Is. 21. 11-22. 4	Num. 8. 1 Zech. 2. 14
3rd Nisan	Gen. 3. 22 Ez. 28. 13-19	Ex. 13. 1 Is. 46. 3-13	Num. 10. 1 ?
4th Nisan	Gen. 5. 1 Is. 29. 18-24	Ex. 14. 15/15. 1 Is. 65. 24-66. 10	Num. 11. 23 ?
1st Iyyar	Gen 6. 9 Is. 54. 9-17	Ex. 15. 22/16. 4 Is. 63. 11 Is. 58. 2 Is. 33. 16	Num. 13. 1

---

[1] Jewish Worship, p. 21. The reference to Genesis 6 (followed by (sic)) is a mistake--Genesis 3 is intended. However the haphtarah to Genesis 3 (Ezek. 28) has no connection with John 6, whereas the haphtarah to Genesis 6 does. Thus the argument is not quite as tight as this quotation would suggest. Unfortunately Asher Finkel has perpetuated and, it might be said, compounded, this confusion when he states "Jesus' sermon on 'bread of life' at Kapharnahum is illustrated by A. Guilding... to be based on the reading from Genesis 6. 9 and Is. 54. 9-55. 5--similarly found in Luke on the sermon at Nazareth." This is perhaps as good an illustration as any of an incautious use of this material.

[2] Based on the chart found in Jewish Worship, p. 234. This chart lists only sedarim. There is nowhere in the book a listing of haphtaroth. A convenient chart is found in the Jewish Encyclopedia XII, 254ff, but it mixes together several kinds of sources and at the very least must be corrected by Mann's analysis.

The passages which Miss Guilding has actually used in her interpretation of John 6 are underlined. It is clear that a longitude of several weeks has been allowed in order to bring several texts into the orbit of Passover. The chart also makes clear the way in which passages from any of the three years in the cycle may be used to explain a sermon taking place in any given year.[1] The points of contact between John 6 and the lections of the triennial cycle are laid out below. Notice that not all the words or themes in common are taken from the discourse in John 6 but that some are found in the narrative.

Numbers 11 (LXX)	Exodus 16 (LXX)	John 6
v. 1: And the people murmured sinfully before the Lord.	v. 2: All the congregation of the children of Israel murmured against Moses and Aaron.	vv. 41-43: The Jews therefore murmured because of him. . Jesus answered, murmur not among yourselves.
vv. 21-22: And Moses said, 'The people among whom I am are six-hundred thousand footmen, and thou saidst, I will give them flesh to eat... shall sheep and oxen be slain for them and shall it suffice (arkesei) them? Or shall all the fish of the sea (pan to opsos) be gathered together for them and shall it suffice them?	v. 18: He that had gathered much had nothing over, and he that had gathered less had no lack.	vv. 7, 9: Two hundred pennyworth of bread is not sufficient for them (ouk arkousin autois) that every one of them may take a little... There is a lad here that hath five barley loaves and two fishes (opsaria) but what are these among so many?

[1]Someone might reply that a congregation accustomed to a hearing of the Scriptures in a triennial cycle might be able to hold in mind the readings associated with a particular time of the year in all three years of the cycle. This is conceivable for important festivals, but to the present author seems hard to imagine for ordinary Sabbaths. For example, in congregations which today use a biennial cycle (the Presbyterian Book of Common Worship used in America sets forth a biennial lectionary), how many persons could remember what the Gospel for the 13th Sunday after Trinity had been the previous year?

Numbers 11 (LXX)	Exodus 16 (LXX)	John 6
v. 13: Moses said unto the Lord, When shall I have flesh to give unto all these people: For they weep unto me saying 'Give us flesh that we may eat.'	v. 12: Toward evening ye shall eat flesh and in the morning ye shall be satisfied with bread.	vv. 51, 55: I am the living bread which came down out of heaven... yea and the bread which I give is my flesh... For my flesh is true meat and my blood is true drink.

Genesis 3 (LXX)	John 6
v. 3: Of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.	v. 50: This is the bread which cometh down out of heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die.
v. 22: And now lest he put forth his hand and take of the tree of life and eat and live forever (zēsetaieis ton aiōna).	v. 51: .. if any man eat of this bread he shall live forever (zēsetai eis ton aiōna).
v. 24: So he drove out the man (kai exebalen ton Adam).	Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out (ou mē ekbalō exō).

Isaiah 54. 9-55. 3	
55. 2: Wherefore do you spend money for that which is not bread? and your labor for that which satisfieth not? hearken diligently unto me, and eat ye that which is good, and let your soul delight in fatness. Incline your ear and come unto me; hear and your soul shall live.	v. 27: Work not for the meat which perisheth, but for the meat which abideth unto eternal life, which the Son of Man shall give unto you.
54. 13: And all thy children shall be taught of the Lord.	v. 63: The word that I have spoken unto you are spirit and life.
	v. 45: It is written in the prophets: 'And they shall all be taught of God.'

#191. Critique. --There are some close parallels here. There is no doubt that John is reflecting on the feeding of Israel in the wilderness. But a word needs to be said about the procedure of using the LXX. The identity of

words in John 6 and the LXX of the Old Testament passages is used to clinch the argument that we are dealing here not with general themes but with specific texts. The implicit argument is that this sermon took place at the end of Nisan and made use of the lections around that time. Presumably the sermon was given in Aramaic or Hebrew. At some point in its recensional history this sermon, or a condensed form of it, was translated into Greek--the form in which we now have it. In this Greek form it bears close resemblance to certain words in the LXX rendering of lections for the end of Nisan (e. g. opsos in Numbers 11. 22). The appeal to the text of the LXX really makes sense, however, only if we make an additional assumption concerning the background of the Fourth Gospel: that the author is writing a Christian commentary on the Jewish lectionary cycle for a congregation that is using this cycle in a Greek translation that is textually identical with our LXX. Thus the relevance of Miss Guilding's detailed verbal evidence rests upon a threefold assumption: a knowledge and use of the Jewish lectionary cycle on the part of Jesus, the author of the Fourth Gospel, and the congregation for whom he is writing (which is using a Greek translation of the lections). None of these assumptions has any external support; all depend upon inference from internal data. [1]

---

[1]There is also the problem of Miss Guilding's imprecision in her use of evidence. The lections which she uses to illustrate Jesus' Passover speech are drawn from the period after Passover, whereas John 6. 4 clearly states that the speech is given before Passover. (Jn. 6. 4 sets the stage for the feeding of the multitude with the phrase "Now the Passover, the feast of the Jews, was at hand"--ēn de eggus to pascha hē heortē tōn Ioudaiōn; 6. 22 states that Jesus' discourse took place the day after the feeding). Miss Guilding notes this problem, but resolves it by another conjecture: "Possibly the Evangelist has conflated an informal discussion held at Passover-time with a synagogue sermon preached shortly afterwards" (p. 61). For the lack of external

Summary of Evidence for a Prophetic Lectionary

#192. An insecure base. --The evidence for the use of a prophetic lectionary in the synagogue of Jesus' time is tantalizing, but it is not solid enough to build upon. The crucial point is that even if it existed, we may not be able to reconstruct it. Too many hypotheses are needed to make the data of the New Testament fit the reconstructed lectionary. We must heed Büchler's warning that later lectionary lists are out of touch with earlier practice. It might be that had Mann lived to complete his study of the homilies, so that it would have been extended through the rest of the Pentateuch, more evidence of links between late lists and early midrashic texts would have been forthcoming. As it now stands, Mann, although himself convinced that in certain instances early liturgical practice is preserved in late homilies, may have only given us instances of the link between early midrashic traditions and late lectionary lists. At the present then the lectionary thesis is one worth considering, but cannot be regarded as proved.[1] Future study may change this picture. Until the time when more

---

evidence, see the discussion by W. D. Davies, "Reflections on Archbishop Carrington's 'The Primitive Christian Calendar'," in Christian Origins and Judaism (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962), p. 70. On the other hand, there is possible significance in the lack of such evidence in the place where one might expect to find it, e. g. Melito's Homily on the Passion, which makes frequent use of the Old Testament but does not seem to reflect on the same passages associated with Passover by Jewish tradition. See C. Bonner, Studies and Documents, XII (London, 1940) and G. Zuntz, HTR, XXXVI (1943), pp. 299-315.

[1]For the convenience of the reader a summary of Miss Guilding's main arguments, especially where she differs with Büchler, is given: (1) The triennial cycle has its origins in the time of Ezra as dates and structure of the Pentateuch and Psalter indicate, and thus did not originate in controversy between Pharisees and Sadducees as Büchler thought; (2) The cycle began in the month Nisan (in agreement with Büchler but pace Mann and Elbogen);

evidence can be brought forward, this thesis is an insecure foundation for New Testament studies. However it may be one fruitful way of getting into the very complex field of early midrashic traditions.

#193. Luke 4. 16-30. --With the general thesis considered at some length, we may now return to the question which opened this section--the analysis of the Nazareth pericope against the background of the lectionary cycle. We will again set out in tabular form the passages which Miss Guilding sees related to this pericope:

1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year
3rd Tishri: Gen 35. 9	Lev. 9. 1	Deut. 7. 12
Is. 43. 1-21	I Kg. 8. 56-58	Is. 4. 6
Is. 61. 1 (?)		
4th Tishri: Gen. 37. 1		Deut. 9. 1
Is. 32. 18-33. 15	Lev. 12. 1	Jer. 2
	Is. 66	
1st Marheshvan		
Gen. 38. 1	Lev. 13. 29	Deut. 10. 1
II Sam 11. 2	II Kg. 5	II Kg. 13. 23

---

(3) Evidence which suggests a Tishri cycle reflects variant local practice. Thus the Talmudic statement (Meg. 29a) which argues for a Tishri is either mistaken or reflects a local situation (p. 17). John is acquainted with both a Nisan and a Tishri cycle and has used both. The present book is based on Nisan, but another could be written using a Tishri cycle as the basis (p. 213). (4) Adar is a special problem--originally the cycle ended in the third year at the end of Adar, not the beginning, as Büchler thought. Thus the Mishnah's designation of four special lections for Adar (Meg. iv) must be a later development (although it is our earliest datable information on the development of the lectionary). Miss Guilding conjectures that originally, the four special lections were designated for second (intercalated) Adar, and that eventually they came to be read during first Adar, and the practice of the Karaites to intercalate a month before the final month may help explain this shift (p. 242); (5) Both law and prophets were read in the triennial cycle and knowledge of this lectionary is possible through late lists and homiletical and midrashic sources which are believed to preserve ancient liturgical practices.

2nd Marḥesvan

Lev. 14. 1	Deut. 11. 10
II Kg. 7	Is. 54. 11-55. 6

The underlined passages are those Miss Guilding believes are pertinent to the Lukan passage. The tabular presentation gives the false impression that our knowledge of the lectionary cycle for this part of the year is quite full. But when we inquire into the actual sources for the designation of these texts, we enter a morass. In the first place, Miss Guilding not only does not provide a convenient table for the haphtaroth, in her discussion rarely identifies the sources of her knowledge except to say vaguely "according to Büchler" with no page number! Thus it is terribly difficult to retrace her steps. My research in Büchler and Mann turns up the following: (1) Is. 61. 1 is linked with Gen. 35. 9 on the basis of inference from the content of the Genesis 35 homily. Mann's argument is not too convincing, and it probably points to a late situation anyway.[1] Nowhere in the lists is Is. 61. 1 included in the haphtaroth (although other portions of Is. 61 do come in). (2) II Kg. 5 and 7 are listed by Büchler as haphtaroth for Lev. 13. 29 and 14. 1.[2] The normal sources fail at this point. The Fustāt list is not extant here. Mann's work does not extend beyond Exodus. Büchler says vaguely that we know these haphtaroth from "different sources" and means by this the liturgies of the

---

[1]Mann, Old Synagogue, pp. 283-285. The supposed points of contact between Gen. 35. 9ff and Is. 61. 2-9; 62. 1-2 (The haphtarah which Mann reconstructs for the homily) are liqro (Is. 61. 2) and yiqqare (Gen. 35. 10); the "new name" of Is. 62. 2 and the giving of Jacob a new name in Gen. 35. 9-10; the "comfort those who mourn" of Is. 61. 2 and the death of Rachel in 35. 16; the homilist makes the point that God appeared to Jacob to comfort him.

[2]Büchler, VI, p. 35.

Karaites, the Spanish and German Jews, the Babylonian cycle--all of which were annual cycles, not triennial. It is true that annual cycles probably evolved from triennial cycles, although that is a complex question in itself. But clearly one cannot argue simply from the latter to the former and claim to have the practice of the Nazareth synagogue. (3) II Kg. 13. 25 is deduced to belong to Deut. 10. 1 according to Masoretic divisions in the prophets, which Büchler admits is a very indefinite procedure.[1] Thus the sources are compiled according to widely variant methods and from widely separated places and times. When one adds to this the longitude and latitude allowed in the selection of passages after the lectionary is reconstructed, the tenuousness becomes more apparent. However, if with this reconstruction one was really able to shed light on Lk. 4. 16-30, one might be inclined to tolerate the speculative nature of the reconstruction in order to enjoy the results. But as a matter of fact, the supposed links between Lk. 4. 16-30 and this reconstructed lectionary are both far-fetched and trivial. These links are as follows:

(1) Is. 61. 1-2 is quoted in Lk. 4. 18-19.

(2) Lk. 4. 27 contains an allusion to II Kg. 5.

(3) The phrase polloi leproi in Lk. 4. 27 is an allusion to II Kg. 7. 3--the four lepers sitting by the gate.

(4) The phrase "the heavens were shut up" in Lk. 4. 25 is an allusion to Deut. 11. 17.

(5) The word katakrēmnizō "to throw down headlong" in Lk. 4. 29 is both a LXX and NT hapax-legomenon--it occurs at II Chron. 25. 12. Material parallel to II Chron. 25. 12 is found in II Kg. 13. 23.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 33-34.

(6) A similar situation is found with the term ophrus "brow of the hill" in Lk. 4. 29 and Lev. 14. 9 ("eyebrow").

(7) Lk. 4. 16-30 comes immediately after the Temptation scene where there are quotations from Deut. 6 and 8. These Deut. passages are read in the middle of Tishri, just before the period which relates to the Nazareth pericope.

(8) A line from Lk. 4. 30 ("but passing through the midst of them he went away") is found in certain Mss. (C, Koine, f, q, r, Peshitta) of John 8. 59 after the line "so they took up stones to throw at him; but Jesus hid himself and went out of the temple." According to Miss Guilding, John 8-9 is also based on Tishri passages; thus this textual variant seems to be a striking confirmation of the fact that both texts share the same lectionary background.

#194. Critique. --These links are of widely varying character. Altogether they make quite a collection of coincidences which in our view rest upon uncertain grounds and can be explained more simply in other ways.

(1) rests upon the uncertain status of Is. 61. 1 as an early haphtarah.

(2) rests upon the late evidence for II Kg. 5 as haphtarah to Lev. 13. 29. Moreover the link with the seder is without significance for the understanding of Luke 4. 27.

(3) rests both on the late evidence for II Kg. 7. 3 as haphtarah, and upon the unlikely assumption that polloi leproi refers to any specific Old Testament text, (see section #104).

(4) rests upon a seder, which is a more solid base, but again involves selecting a certain OT passage as the background when in fact the phrase is fairly common as our study has shown (section #100).

(5) rests upon a very tenuous link with II Kg. 13. 23 via II Chron. 25. 12; the status of II Kg. 13. 23 is uncertain anyway and the link provides no insight into the significance of the means chosen by the people to kill Jesus. Moreover this verse is part of the Lukan composition, not his source (as vss. 25-27 might be); thus Guilding has shifted the nature of the argument from Jesus' acquaintance with the lections to Luke's acquaintance with the lectionary in a LXX-form.

(6) rests upon a ground similar to (5) with the added difficulty that the word ophrus is used in an entirely different sense in Lev. 14. 9, whereas the word as a term for the edge of a cliff is common in Hellenistic Greek.

(7) seems striking until one notices that there is really no contact at all between the Nazareth pericope and the sedarim for the third year. In fact Guilding is working entirely with the haphtaroth in Lk. 4. 16-30, with all the conjectures that involves. If links (1)-(6) are invalidated, (7) is without significance.

(8) rests upon the validity of the analysis of John 8-9, which we cannot take up here. A much simpler explanation would be that certain scribes made a mental association between the passages, since both involve Jesus' somewhat miraculous escape from an attempt on his life.

#195. Summary of the excursus on the lectionary theory. --We have tried to show that the generally speculative nature of the thesis is to be seen also at the level of detailed analysis of NT texts and that this approach does not in fact shed light upon the NT at least in the case of Lk. 4. 16-30. Many aspects of the pericope are untouched by this analysis--the conflate quotation in 4. 18-19, the reference to Elijah in 4. 25, and the basic problems of the pericope as summarized above in sections #83-96. But this excursus into the lectionary theory has not been entirely fruitless. While the theory itself is unproved, it provides an entry into the area of midrashic traditions. The complexity of this area is apparent after a study of this kind. We have seen how texts were interpreted by joining one text with another on the basis of verbal links and then elaborated, one in the light of the other. We have also seen that the evidence for these midrashic links takes several different forms. It is this multiplicity of form that is of great importance for NT methodology--or more precisely it is the fact that these different expressions of midrashic activity give a similar appearance which requires that the NT exegete be very careful in his procedure. Thus this inquiry into the possibility of Jewish exegetical traditions behind Lk. 14. 16-30 must be continued now along another line. We will take up first the use of the Old Testament in early

Jewish thought on Elijah and Elisha and then to the interpretation of Is. 61. 1-2 in early Jewish sources.

#196. Elijah and Elisha in Jewish sources. --For the purposes of this section I have sought out every reference to Elijah and Elisha in early Jewish sources. This means that I have looked into the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Mishnah, the Targums, Josephus, Philo, Pseudo-Philo, the Lives of the Prophets, and the Apocalypse of Elijah. For references in the Talmudic and Midrashic literature I have been dependent upon compendia on Elijah. [1] The purpose of this research has been to determine with what biblical passages Elijah and Elisha are associated in the earliest strata available to us, and to see if in this earlier literature we find any anticipation of or preparation for themes to be found in the later sources (e. g. Mekilta and Leviticus Rabbah). The most fruitful sources prove to be Sirach, the Mishnah, Pseudo-Philo and Targum Yerushalmi. The Dead Sea Scrolls fail to mention Elijah or Elisha. [2] The pseudepigraphical literature contains only scattered references to Elijah. [3] Josephus' paraphrase of the

---

[1]Hermann L. Strack und Paul Billerbeck, "Der Prophet Elias nach seiner Entruckung aus dem Diesseits," Kommentar, Vol. IV, pp. 764-798; L. Ginzberg, The Legends of the Jews, trans. Henrietta Szold, Vol. IV: From Joshua to Esther (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1942), pp. 195-235; Georg Fohrer, Elia ("Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments," No. 31; Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1957); J. Jeremias, "Elias," TWNT, Vol. II, pp. 930-943.

[2]These names do not appear in Karl Georg Kuhn's Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960). This concordance does include proper names.

[3]Enoch 89. 52: Elijah is called from the sheep and sent to the sheep, and when they attempt to kill him, is saved and sped away where he cries aloud over the sheep. There is a trace here of Elijah's intercessory role. Enoch 93. 8: an allusion to Elijah's "ascension." Enoch 70. 31 ("that ram") may also be an allusion to Elijah. IV Ezra 7. 109: Elijah intercedes for rain and for the dead. These same incidents in Elijah's life are referred to in Luke 4 and 7. Without particular significance are II Baruch 77. 24 and Martyrdom of Isaiah, 2. 14. In IV Ezra 6. 26, Elijah is probably meant as one of those who "have

Old Testament Elijah narratives, while manifesting some acquaintance with extra-biblical interpretations, does not provide any material pertaining directly to our study.[1] Philo makes no allegorical use of the figure of Elijah (or Elisha). He is mentioned briefly in Quod Deus, 136, in connection with his visit to the widow.[2] In the Lives of the Prophets we are dealing with Greek and Latin manuscripts of a document of uncertain origin and age but thought to preserve a Jewish Grundschrift.[3] The Apocalypse of Elijah

---

been taken up, who have not tasted death." These will appear at the end time and "then shall the heart of the inhabitants of the world be changed and be converted to a different spirit." In I Macc. 2.58, Elijah is mentioned as having been taken up into heaven because of his great zeal for the law. In the Zadokite Document 9.28, Elisha is briefly mentioned, but the meaning of the passage is unclear.

[1]In Jewish War iv. 460, Elisha is mentioned as the successor to Elijah and as having "cured" the fountain at Jericho of its brackishness, (II Kings 2.19).

[2]In this reference Philo reflects the common midrashic theme that the effect of Elijah's visit was to increase the widow's consciousness of sin.

[3]Theodor Schermann, Propheten-und Apostellegenden ("Texte und Untersuchungen," Vol. XXXI, No. 3; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1907), pp. 109-111. The editor regards the text to be 1st Century Christian with a Jewish Grundschrift. The sections dealing with Elijah and Elisha (pp. 109-114) present some interesting material to which some reference will be made below (sections #205, #207). Elijah's birth is given miraculous overtones playing mainly on the theme of fire: he is wrapped in fiery swaddling clothes, fed with fire by angels, etc. The statement that his mission is to judge Israel with fire and the sword is reminiscent of Isaiah 66.16. (Elijah is also mentioned at some length in the section on Jonah (p. 55) who is here (and elsewhere) said to be the boy raised from the dead by Elijah (cf. section #205 below).) Sections considered by the editor to be later glosses are dependent upon Sirach 48.1-10 and Malachi 3. Portents attend the birth of Elisha as well: a golden calf cries out, anticipating Elisha's prophetic task of destroying idols. The miracles of raising the dead and healing Naaman are mentioned, and the power to raise the dead is related particularly to Elisha's having been given a double portion of spirit.

The Lives have also been edited by C.C. Torrey, The Lives of the Prophets ("Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series," Vol. I; Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, 1946). Torrey has

printed the text of Q (Codex Marchalianus), a LXX Ms. which contains the lives. This brief version of the Lives he believes was written before 80 A. D. The textual history has been quite complex, to some extent varying from prophet to prophet, and giving rise to several expanded versions in Greek, Latin and Syriac. These fuller versions are printed by Schermann, who has bracketed what he considers later editions. Torrey's arguments for a first century date are: (1) In the section on Elijah it states that he was ek gēs Arabōn... oikōn en Galaad. Torrey argues that Gilead was part of "the land of the Arabs"--i. e. the Nabatean kingdom--only until early in the second century when it came under the hands of the Romans, and that the last Nabatean king about whom we have certain knowledge was Rabel, c. 80 A. D. (2) He thinks that there has been included into the Life of Jeremiah a passage which has all the ear-marks of a late Christian interpolation, but which Torrey argues is authentic Egyptian folklore, transmitted by a Jewish-Christian narrator to Jerusalem where the Jewish author of the Lives accepted it as legitimate Jeremiah tradition. He thinks such relations between Jerusalem Jews and Egyptian Jewish-Christians would be unlikely after 80 A. D. (the time of the anathema of Gamaliel II against Christians and their writings) (p. 11). This argument can be set aside as extremely weak. (3) Torrey's final argument rests on his own thesis that Matthew was written by 50 A. D. and also involves the passage in Jeremiah, and so must be set aside as well. It is also implied that because there are so many place-names in the Lives which we know nothing of, it can be assumed that they are Palestinian towns and places which are early and thus not known to us in later sources. All of these arguments must be judged very weak for the dating of this document. More suggestive is the parallel between a passage in the Life of Isaiah and John 9. 7; Siloam ho hermeneuetai apestalmenos. This is argued by Franklin W. Young as striking evidence that the Lives were in circulation before the Gospel of John ("A Study of the Relation of Isaiah to the Fourth Gospel," ZNW, XLVI (1955), p. 220. Schermann points out that while the Lives deviate at many points from rabbinic tradition, there are points of contact with the Martyrdom of Isaiah, The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, II Maccabees and Josephus, (pp. 118-121). Neither Schermann nor Torrey have provided a list of citations or allusions to the Lives. Perhaps the earliest Ms. is Q, which is sixth century. A sound case can be made, I think, for the view that the document as we have it is Jewish in origin with Christian additions. The early dating rests in part on the assumption that after the first century, there is not much if any Jewish apocryphal literature being produced. Jewish literature of the second-fifth centuries one would expect to have more contact with rabbinic literature known to us. The affinities with documents like Martyrdom of Isaiah and the Testaments at least suggests an early date for the original.

presents a similar situation.[1]

#197. Elijah in early Jewish sources. --We will first of all simply reproduce the texts important for our purposes and then discuss their significance.

> Sanhedrin 47a: Elisha said, "I pray let me inherit a double share of thy spirit." (II Kings 2. 9). Where do we find that Elisha has raised the dead twice? R. Jochanan has said, "He has healed Naaman the leper who (in his leprosy) is to be regarded as equivilent to a dead person, as it says in Numbers 12. 12 'Let her (the leprous Miriam) not be as one dead' (Aaron is pleading with God.)"[2]

> Mishnah, Sota, 9. 15:--R. Phineas b. Jair says, 'Heedfulness leads to cleanliness, and cleanliness leads to purity, and purity leads to abstinence, and abstinence leads to holiness, and holiness leads to humility (ענוה) and humility leads to shunning of sin, and the shunning of sin leads to the Holy Spirit, and the Holy Spirit leads to the resurrection of the dead, and the resurrection of the dead shall come through Elijah of blessed memory.'[3]

> The same passage is found in Abodah Zarah 20b where it is added: 'saintliness is the greatest of these for Scripture says 'Thou didst speak in vision to thy saintly ones' (Ps. 89. 20). This differs from the view of R. Joshua b. Levy for he said, meekness is the greatest of all, for Scripture says 'The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me...'" (Is. 61. 1). It does not say 'unto the saints' but 'unto the meek' from whence you learn that meekness is the greatest of all these.[4] In another version in Midrash Song of Songs, Ezekiel 37, 14.. "And I will put my spirit in you and you shall live" is linked with the phrase "and the Holy Spirit leads to resurrection: and the reference to Elijah is linked with Mal. 3. 23.[5]

---

[1]Georg Steindorff, Die Apokalypse des Elias ("Texte und Untersuchungen," Vol. XVII, No. 32; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1899), p. 19.

[2]English translation by H. Freedman, London: The Soncino Press, 1935.

[3]English translation by Danby, Mishnah, pp. 306-307.

[4]English translation by A. Mishcon in The Babylonian Talmud, Nezikin Vol. VII (London: Soncino Press, 1935), pp. 106-107.

[5]English translation by M. Simon, Midrash Song of Songs (London: Soncino Press, 1939), pp, 11-12.

Mishnah, Eduyoth 8.7: R. Joshua said, I have received as a tradition from Rabban Johanan b. Zakkai, who heard from his teacher, and his teacher from his teacher, as a halakah given Moses from Sinai, that Elijah will not come to declare unclean or clean, to remove afar or to bring nigh, but to remove afar those (families) that were brought nigh by violence and to bring nigh those families that were removed afar by violence. ...R. Judah says: To bring nigh but not to remove afar. R. Simeon says; To bring agreement where there is matter for dispute. And the Sages say: Neither to remove afar nor to bring nigh, but to make peace in the world, as it is written, 'Behold I will send you Elijah the prophet...' (Mal. 4.5f).

Sirach 48.1-11: (RSV):

Then the prophet Elijah arose like fire
and his word burned like a torch.
He brought a famine upon them,
and by his zeal he made them few in number.
By the word of the Lord he shut up the heavens,
and also three times brought down fire.
How glorious you were, O Elijah, in your wondrous deeds!
And who has the right to boast which you have?
You who raised a corpse from death
and from Hades by the word of the Most High;
Who brought kings down to destruction
and famous men from their beds;
Who heard rebuke at Sinai
and judgements of vengeance at Horeb;
who anointed kings to inflict retribution,
and prophets to succeed you.
You who were taken up by a whirlwind of fire,
in a chariot with horses of fire;
you who are ready at the appointed time, it is written
to calm the wrath of God before it breaks out in fury,
to turn the heart of the father to the son,
and to restore the tribes of Jacob.
Blessed are those who saw you,
and those who have been adored in love
for we also shall surely live.

Sirach 48.12-14 (RSV):

It was Elijah who was covered by the whirlwind
and Elisha was filled with his spirit;
in all his days he did not tremble before any ruler,
and no one brought him into subjection.
Nothing was too hard for him,
and when he was dead his body prophesied.
As in his life he did wonders,
so in death his deeds were marvelous.

Sirach 48. 22b-25 (RSV):

Isaiah the prophet... who was great and
faithful in his vision.
In his days the sun went backward,
and he lengthened the life of the king.
By the spirit of might he saw the las things,
and comforted those who mourn in Zion.
He revealed what was to occur to the end of time,
and the hidden things before they came to pass.

Sirach 48. 10f. Hebrew:[1]

הכתוב נכון לעת להשבית אף
לפנ[י בא יום יי']
להשיב לב אבות על בנים
ולהכין ש[בטי ישרא]ל

Sirach 48. 10f. Greek:

ὁ καταγραφεὶς ἐν ἐλεγμοῖς εἰς καιροὺς
κοπάσαι ὀργὴν πρὸ θυμοῦ
ἐπιστρέφαι καρδίον πατρὸς πρὸς υἱον
καὶ καταστῆσαι φυλὰς Ἰακωβ

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, Number 25. 12:[2]

בשבועה אימר לימר ליה מן שמי האנא
גזר ליה ית קימי שלם
ואעבדוניח מלאך קיים
ויחי לאלם למבשרא גאולתא בסוף יומיא

---

[1]Israel Levi, The Hebrew Text of the Book of Ecclesiasticus ("Semitic Study Series," ed. Richard J. H. Gottheil and Morris Jastrow, Jr., No. 3; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1904), p. 67.

[2]Moses Ginsburger, Pseudo-Jonathan; Targum Jonathan ben Usiël zum Pentateuch, nach der Londoner Handschrift, British Museum add. 27031 (Berlin: S. Calvary & Co., 1903), p. 278. According to Wilhelm Bacher, "Targum," Jewish Encyclopedia, ed. Isidore Singer, XII (1906), 59, Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, although "it was made as late as the seventh century, approximates the original Targum much more closely both in diction and

Eng. tr.: In an oath say to him (Phineas) in my name, Behold I make with him my covenant of peace, and I will make him messenger of the covenant and he will life forever to proclaim the good news of salvation in the last days.

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, Exodus 4. 13:[1]

ואמר בבעו ברחמין מן קדמך ה׳ שלח כדון
שליחותך ביד פנחס דחמי למשתלחא בסוף יומיא

Eng. tr.: And (Moses) said, I pray in mercy before thee Yahweh, send now thy commission through Phineas who is chosen to be sent at the end of days.

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, Exodus 6. 18:[2]

ושני חייוי דקהת חסידא מאה ותלתין ותלת
שנין חיא עד דחמא ית פינחס הוא אליהו
כהנא רבא דעתיד למשתלחא לגלותא דישראל
בסוף יומייא:

Eng. tr.: And the years of the life of Qohath, the pious, are 133 years until he sees Phineas, who is Elijah the high priest who is ready to be sent to the exile of Israel in the last days.

---

content, and includes many elements earlier than the Targum bearing the name Onkelos and belonging in its final form to the third century."

[1]Ginsburger, Pseudo-Jonathan, pp. 103-104.

[2]Ibid., p. 107. A comparison of all these passages from Pseudo-Jonathan with the newly identified manuscript of Targum Yerushalmi: Codex Neofiti I (Microfilm copy; Numbers 25. 12--Plate 326; Ex. 4. 13--Platell6; Ex. 6. 18--Plate 119), reveals that Neofiti agrees with Onkelos at these points in its almost-word-for-word rendering of the Hebrew text.

Pseudo-Philo, Liber Antiquitatem Biblicarum, XLVIII:[1] Et in tempore eo Finees reclinavit se ut moreretur, et dixit ad eum Dominus: Ecce transisti centumviginti annos, qui constituti erant omni homini. Et nunc exurge et vade hinc, et habita in Danaben, in monte, et inhabita ibi annis pluribus, et mandabo ego aquile mei, et nutriet te ibi, et non descendes ad homines, iam quousque perveniat tempus ut proberis in tempore, et tu claudas celum tunc, et in ore tuo aperietur. Et postea elevaberis in locum ubi elevati sunt priores tui, et eris ibi quousque memorabor seculi. Et tunc adducam vos, et gustabitis quod est mortis.

At that time also Phinees laid himself down to die, and the Lord said unto him: Behold thou hast overpassed the 120 years that were ordained unto all men. And now arise and go hence and dwell in the mount Danaben and abide there many years, and I will command my eagle and he shall feed thee there, and thou shalt not come down any more unto men until the time come and thou be proved in the time. And then thou shalt shut up the heavens and at thy word it shall be opened. And after that thou shalt be lifted up into the place whither they that were before thee were lifted up and shalt be there until I remember the world. And then I will bring you and ye shall taste what is death. 2

Sifre Numbers 131 (Num. 25. 13):[3] 'Dafür, dass er für seinen Gott geeifert hat,' (D. h.) "dafür, dass er sein Leben dem Tode preisgab." (Jes. 53. 12).

---

[1]Guido Kisch, Pseudo-Philo, p. 239.

[2]M. R. James, The Biblical Antiquities of Philo ("Translations of Early Documents," Series I: Palestinian Jewish Texts; London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1917), p. 210. James regarded this document to be "a product of the same school as the Fourth Book of Esdras and the Apocalypse of Baruch, and written, like them, in the years which followed the destruction of Jerusalem in A. D. 70." (p. 7). Depending largely upon the studies of Leopold Cohn, Kisch regards it as quite certain that the work was written by a Jew, in Hebrew, in first century Palestine, (pp. 16-17). Cf. Kisch, pp. 98-106, for a bibliography on this document. A more recent study is by Otto Eissfeldt, "Zum Komposition Technik Pseudo-Philo Liber Antiquitatem Biblicarum," Interpretations ad Vetus Testamentum (Festschrift S. Mowinckle) Oslo, 1955.

[3]Karl Georg Kuhn, Der Tannaitische Midrasch Sifre zu Numeri ("Rabbinische Texte," Vol. II, No. 3; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1959), p. 527.

#198. Sirach 48.--The earliest extra-canonical source for a portrait of Elijah which has been built upon biblical passages is found in Sirach 48. 1-11, and it deserves our close attention. This summary is interesting (1) in the way in which it divides the career of the prophet into two sections: his historical career (vss. 1-9) and his eschatological role (vss. 10-11); (2) in the way it has selected certain events from the biblical Elijah narrative; and (3) in the way it has elaborated upon the biblical narrative through the association of Elijah with other biblical passages. It is not our purpose here to provide an exhaustive analysis of this section, but only to point out features of direct concern for our study. Attention has already been called to the stress placed upon Elijah as man of fire, as well as to the statement that Elijah brings on a limos because aneschen ouranon (vs. 3; Lk. 4. 25--ekleisthē ho ouranos; this phrase does not actually occur in the OT Elijah narrative). Vs. 5 makes reference to Elijah's raising of the widow's son (ho egeiras nekron ek thanatou). Vss. 1-9 generally emphasize Elijah's role as a zealous judge (in addition to the "fire" imagery, note vs. 3-- tōi zēlōi autou ōligopoiēsen autous; vs. 6--ho katagagōn basileis eis apōleian; vs. 7--krimata ekdikēseōs; vs. 8--ho chriōn basileis eis antapodoma).

#199. Sirach 48. 10-11. --By contrast, Elijah's eschatological role appears rather more gracious, at least in the Hebrew text. There are textual difficulties in these verses, as a comparison of the Hebrew and Greek reveals, and at several points, especially in verse 11, the Hebrew text fails us altogether. The Greek en elegmois is suggested by Smend to be a corruption

of hetoimos (Hebrew--nakon).[1] Thus the first phrase should read: "Who, it is written, is ready at the appointed time.." It seems clear that hakath v refers to Mal. 4.5. The next phrase reads, in the Hebrew text, "to put an end to wrath before...." The Greek reads "to quiet anger before wrath." This is usually interpreted so that it would read "to quiet the anger (of men) before (it becomes) wrath." Levi's text has followed the Syriac in its restoration of the Hebrew: "to put an end to wrath before the day of the Lord comes." This would bring the verse into even closer contact with Malachi 4.5: (lifne bo' yom adonai). However, the task of "putting and end to wrath" cannot be read literally out of the Malachi passages, although it might be deduced from the task of "turning the heart of the father to the son" which Sirach 48.10 quotes in the next line. There is another possible explanation for this phrase, however, which is at least worth exploring.

#200. Elijah and Phineas. --In Number 25.11, it reads: "Phineas has turned back my wrath from the people of Israel," (heshiv 'eth ḥamathi me 'al bene yisrael). For this God makes with him a "covenant of peace" (berithi shalom), because he was "jealous for his God" (quinne' le 'lohaw) and "made atonement for the people of Israel." Passages are quoted above from the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and the Biblical Antiquities of Pseudo-Philo which show that Elijah and Phineas were associated with each other. This has probably taken place through a midrashic connection between Mal. 3.1 ("the messenger of the covenant in which you delight"--wumalak haberith asher

---

[1]Rudolf Smend, Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach (Berlin: Georg Reimar, 1906), p. 461.

atem hafetsim) and the berith shalom of Num. 25. 12. Another midrashic connection is that both Elijah and Phineas are "jealous" for God: I Kings 19. 10--qanno qinne' thi ladonai, "I have been very jealous for the Lord," and Numbers 25. 10--Phineas averts God's wrath beqan'o 'eth qin'athi--"in that he was jealous with my jealousy." That this identification is not a late one is shown by the haggadah from Pseudo-Philo, which is to be dated in the first century.[1] It is to be noted that the unmistakable link between Phineas and Elijah in Pseudo-Philo is the phrase "shut up the heaven." It is not inconceivable, therefore, that the phrase "to put an end to wrath" in Sirach 48. 10 reflects this same link between Elijah and Phineas, and that it is God's wrath which is to be brought to an end before the day of the Lord comes, by Elijah's mission of reconciliation and restoration. The link between Elijah and Phineas in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan may be explored a bit farther. Pseudo-Jonathan, Num. 25. 12, the third line, (ומלאך קיים)clearly alludes to Mal. 3. 1. The phrase ויתי לאלם reflects a widespread and early deduction from Elijah's translation into heaven.[2] The phrase למבשרא גאולתא may reflect a midrashic connection with Isaiah 61. 1 and 63. 4. These two Isaianic passages almost constitute a doublet. In Isaiah 61. 3 we find

---

[1]However, Codex Neofiti I, the complete Palestinian Targum identified recently by H. Diez Macho (Cf. M. Black, "The Recovery of the Language of Jesus," NTS, Vol. III (July, 1957), pp. 305-313) does not contain the haggadic portions found in Pseudo-Jonathan in Numbers 25. 12 and Exodus 4. 12, 6. 18 (the corresponding plates in Neofiti I are 326, 116 and 119 verso, respectively). Since this Targum is thought to be first century Palestinian, the absence of these passages casts some doubt on the antiquity of the Pseudo-Jonathan texts.

[2]E. g. Josephus, Antiq. ix. 22.

shenath rason and yom naqam; in 63. 4 we find shenath ge'ulay and yom naqam. In 61. 1 we find lebaser anawim. The text of Targum Num. 25. 12 has the Hebrew forms rather than the Aramaic. (Targum Is. 63. 4 reads שנת פורקן...יום פורענותא), and so may reflect these biblical passages. It is impossible to date this midrash but it is interesting to see Isaiah 61. 1 drawn into the Elijah orbit in this text. [1]

#201. Elijah the restorer of the tribes of Jacob. --The fourth line of Sirach 48. 10 reads in the Greek "and to restore the tribes of Jacob." The Hebrew text here is mutilated, but appears to read "and to restore the tribes of Israel." Commentators have linked this with Isaiah 49. 6 which reads: "to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the preserved of Israel." (Gk. -- tou stēsai tas phulas Iakōb kai tēn diasporan tou Israēl epistrepsai; Hebrew-- lehaqim eth shivte ya aqov wunsyyrey yisrael lehashiv; Targum Isaiah-- לאקמא ית שבטי יעקב וגלות ישראל לאתבא .

The link is closer in the Greek tradition because of the LXX of Malachi 4. 6-- apokatastēsei kardian patros pros huion, but an allusion would be possible in the Hebrew as well. The significance of this link can be overstated. Strack-Billerbeck's comment goes too far:

---

[1]Mention can be made here of yet another aspect of the Phineas motif, found in Sifre Numbers 25. 13, where there appears to be an allusion to Isaiah 53. 12: "because he exposed his life to death," (Is. 53. 12, Heb--he erah lammaweth nafsho, "he poured out his life to death." The haggadah is making the point that in killing Zimri and his non-Jewish wife, Phineas was exposing himself to death by revenge. The reference to Is. 53. 12 is probably intended to call up the context: "he was numbered with transgressors; yet he bore the sin of man, and made intercession for transgressors." Cf. Moore, Judaism, I, 549, and Notes 252, 253; Ginzberg, Legends, III, pp. 385-6; VI, p. 136ff, and Luke 22. 37.

> Dass der Siracide diese Aufgabe unbedenklich dem wiederkehrenden Elias zuschreibt, beweist, dass er in diesem eine messianische Persönlichkeit gesehen hat. [1]

Smend may also go too far: "Vielleicht verstand Sirach unter jenem Knechte Jahwes den Elias."[2] However, it is interesting to compare Sirach with Targum Pseudo-Jonathan Ex. 6. 18, where it states that Elijah is "ready (עתיד; compare Sirach nakon) to be sent to the exile of Israel in the last days" which compares well with the Targum and LXX of Is. 49. 6--"to restore the exile of Israel." If both Sirach and Pseudo-Jonathan have Isaiah 49. 6 in mind at this point, it would be another significant evidence of the way in which biblical texts were used to build up a portrait of a biblical figure.[3]

#202. Elijah and the resurrection. --Sirach 48. 11 is a very obscure verse, almost complete mutilated in the Hebrew and difficult to understand in the Greek:

יה [חיה ח]..ך .. ...ומת ראך אשר

μακάριοι οἱ ἰδόντες σε
καὶ οἱ ἐν ἀγαπήσει κεκοιμήμενοι
καὶ γὰρ ἡμεῖς ζωῇ ζησόμεθα

---

[1]Kommentar, IV, p. 780.

[2]Smend, Sirach, p. 461.

[3]A similar role of restoration of Israel seems to underly the passage in Mishnah, Eduyoth 8. 7. Unmentioned but surely in the background of this passage is Isaiah 57. 19--"Peace, peace to him that is far and to him that is near." It is not inconceivable that there is reflected here a midrash which has linked Mal. 4. 5 (quoted in the Mishnaic text); the "messenger of the covenant" of Mal. 3. 1; the "covenant of peace" in Numbers 25. 10; and "Peace, peace: of Is. 57. 19. This same passage also seems to reflect some awareness of a duality in Elijah's role--on the one hand a role as priest-judge ("declare clean and unclean) and on the other, a peace-maker ("bring agreement;" "make peace in the world").

At the very least, this verse can be taken as evidence for the idea that Elijah himself never died, and can probably be taken as evidence that Elijah was, in the time of Sirach, or soon after, linked with a hope in the resurrection of the dead.

#203. Summary of Elijah in Sirach 48. --There is at least the suggestion that the elaboration of the figure of Elijah is going in two directions: one, drawn primarily from narratives in Kings, sees him as a fiery judge; the other, which develops his eschatological role using Malachi 3 and 4 as a starting point, sees him as reconciler and restorer. It is in the latter that we see the most evidence of midrashic activity. The events selected from the Elijah narratives correspond well with those found in Luke, e. g. the shutting up of the heavens and the raising of the widow's son. A trace of the identification of Elijah and Phineas in haggadic sources may be seen in Elijah's mission of putting an end to wrath. At some stage, Isaiah 61. 1-3 may have been drawn into this Elijah-Phineas midrashic tradition, as well as Is. 53. 12. There is also some indication that Is. 49. 6 has been linked by Sirach with Elijah, and again, a similar midrash may be seen in the Targum. Finally, Sirach gives evidence of the association of Elijah with hope in resurrection of the dead. This last theme will now be explored in other sources.

#204. Elijah and the resurrection in other sources. --In the Mishnah, Sota 9. 15, it states that "the resurrection of the dead shall come through Elijah of blessed memory." The same passage links the Holy Spirit with resurrection. From the Mishnaic passage alone it is impossible to determine what midrashic basis, if any, lies behind the text. In expanded versions of

the same passage (which is called "The Saint's Progress" in some texts), the reference to Elijah is linked with Mal. 3. 23, but this does not explain his association with resurrection. It is probably to be explained through the link with the Holy Spirit. [1] Elijah has received the Spirit from God, and as a Spirit-anointed person, he is associated with resurrection. An unspoken assumption that the Spirit-anointed prophet can raise the dead is to be found in the passage in Sanhedrin 47a. There, the fact that Elisha has received a double portion of Elijah's Spirit leads to the question--"Where do we find that Elisha has raised the dead twice?" The answer is given that a leper is the same as a corpse, so Elisha's healing of Naaman is equivalent to the raising of a dead person. [2]

---

[1]Notice that in some versions of this passage, Isaiah 61. 1 is brought into connection with the reference to humility (ענו). This suggests that perhaps behind the Mishnaic progression, there is a midrash in which Holy Spirit is a kind of middle term which leads on the one hand in the direction of meekness, humility, and on the other hand in the direction of resurrection. This brings to mind the passage from Mekilta Ex. 22. 10. See section #210 below.

[2]Elisha raises a boy from the dead in II Kings 4. 35, which with the healing of Naaman, makes two resurrections. The equation of the leper and the corpse is widely attested in the early literature: e. g. Mishnah, Negaim, 13. 12; Josephus, Antiq. iii. 264. In BTal. Nedarim 64b (Soncino, p. 206) it says, "Four are accounted as dead: A poor man, a leper, a blind person, and one who is childless." From the standpoint of our study, this is an interesting passage because it brings together four of the elements in Luke 7. 22--the dead, the blind, lepers and the poor. I doubt whether the parallel is of great significance, however. In general rabbinic tradition as well as in the OT, leprosy is frequently a divine punishment (Cf. Numbers 12. 10; II Sam. 3. 29; II Chron. 26. 19; II Kings 15. 5). In Numbers Rabbah, vii. 5, Naaman is said to have been stricken with leprosy for his pride. Thus healing sometimes is said to come only from God himself--Lev. Rabbah xvi. 9--Is. 57. 19 ("Peace, peace to him that is far and to his that is near saith the Lord. . and I will heal him") is interpreted to refer to the leper (who is "far"--i. e. separated outside the camp) whom God himself will heal. It is not impossible that some sense of the similarity of raising the dead and cleansing lepers lies behind the New Testament. Cf. Matthew 10. 8, where Jesus charges the disciples. . "Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse lepers, cast out demons." Luke 4. 24-27 may

#205. Elijah and Jonah. --One important aspect of the association of Elijah with resurrection is his association in rabbinic thought with Jonah, who was said to be the boy Elijah raised from the dead.[1] The same identification is found in Jerome[2] and may lie behind III Corinthians.[3] The earliest source of the tradition is the section on Jonah in The Lives of the Prophets,[4] which puts it into the first century. This tradition may have something to do with the "sign of Jonah" (= "sign of John?"[5]) which has long been a crux.

---

come from a context in which Elijah and Elisha are linked by Spirit and resurrection. In this regard it is interesting to take note of another rabbinic passage in which Elijah's raising of the widow's son is closely related to the drought and to Elijah's having "shut up the heavens." In PTal Berakot 5, 9b (Cf. Ginzberg, Legends, VI, p. 318 for parallels) the ending of the drought is necessary for Elijah to raise the boy because rain is closely linked with resurrection. If as we have suggested, Luke has adapted these verses to his purposes from another context, and that context had to do with resurrection and the Spirit, then the undue emphasis given in vs. 25 to the famine and the drought might be explained by this rabbinic tradition. Luke's leper healings (5. 12-16; 17. 12ff) are interesting when viewed with the thought that some idea of resurrection might be in the background. The leprosy is heightened in 5. 12 by saying the man was full (plērēs) of leprosy. Only in Luke does the man fall on his face before Jesus (= in death?). In 17. 16 (a passage peculiar to Luke) the leper falls on his face and Jesus heals him and commands anastas -- arise!

[1]Ginzberg, Legends, IV, 137; VI, 318.

[2]Ibid.

[3]In this document, Jonah and the widow's son are both given as types for the resurrection. M. R. James, The Apocryphal New Testament (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924), p. 291.

[4]C.C. Torrey, Lives, pp. 27, 42. Torrey has put forth the argument that the best Ms. of the Lives knows nothing of the rabbinic legend, and that all the others have been contaminated by it. His defense of this view is, in the opinion of the present author, strained to the point of absurdity. The passage reads: "Jonah was from the district of Kiriath-maon, near the Gentile city of Azotus on the sea. After he had been cast on shore by the whale and had made his journey to Nineveh, on his return he did not stay in his own land, but took his mother and settled in Tyre, a country of foreign peoples. For he said, 'In this way I will take away my reproach, that I

prophesied falsely against the great city of Nineveh.' Elijah was at that time rebuking the house of Ahab, and having called a famine on the land he fled. Coming to the region of Tyre he found the widow and her son, for he himself could not lodge with the uncircumcised. He brought her a blessing; and when her child died, God raised him from the dead through Elijah, for he wished to show him that it is not possible to flee from God. After the famine was over, Jonah came into the land of Judea." Torrey argues (p. 42, note 46) that the "him" underlined above is Elijah, and he goes on to say "from this account arose, not unnaturally, the widespread rabbinical legend that the 'son' mentioned in I Ki. 17.17 was Jonah (!), although this is made impossible by the preceding narrative, which evidently antedates the legend." The present author cannot follow Torrey's argument at all. It seems clear that the widow and son with whom Elijah stays are none other than Jonah and his mother who are explicitly said to have settled in Tyre. Moreover, they are Israelites in Tyre, so Elijah is able to stay with them because he cannot stay with the uncircumcised. And Jonah's reason for settling in Tyre is clearly presented as a kind of running away from God. So when God raises the widow's son through Elijah to show him he cannot flee God, the him must surely be Jonah, not Elijah. True, Torrey has on his side the fact that Elijah is said to "flee," although it is not said that he flees God. And it is curious that in the paragraph on Elijah, Jonah is not named as such but only called the widow's son. Moreover, in the earlier reference to his mother, she is not identified as a widow. One might suspect that the text as we have it is somewhat composite. But Torrey's argument, based on this text, that the narrative antedates the legend, seems unjustified.

[5]Cf. C. Kraeling, John the Baptist, p. 137, where he argues that the sign of Jonah is a reference to one who has taken the role of Jonah and his call to repentance, i.e. John the Baptist. Kraeling makes no mention of this legend, however, and wonders how the association of John the Baptist with Jonah can be reconciled with his association with Elijah (p. 143). Cf. also J. Hugh Michael, "The Sign of Jonah," JTS XXI (1919/20), pp. 146-159, where it is argued that the phrase to sēmeion Iōna in Mt. 12.39 and Lk. 11.29 should be translated "sign of John" i.e. John the Baptist, and that the evangelists misunderstood Jesus' saying (because of the ease with which the names could be confused) and went on to elaborate on their misunderstanding. The original comparison is between Jonah and John, not Jonah and the Son of Man (Lk. 11.30). But although Michael also affirms the originality of the identification of Elijah and John, he does not apparently know of the Jewish tradition which had linked Elijah and Jonah.

#206. Summary of Elijah. --What Old Testament passages are linked in the midrashic development of Elijah? Sirach has alluded to I Kings 17. 22 (raising the boy); 18. 1 (famine); II Kings 2. 9 (spirit); Mal. 3. 1-3 (messenger of the covenant; fire); Mal. 4. 5 (turn hearts of the fathers to the sons); Num. 25. 10 (turn away wrath; covenant of peace); Is. 49. 6 (restore tribes of Jacob). In other midrashic sources (Targum Yerushalmi, Mishnah, Sifre Numbers) which have several points of contact with Sirach 48, Is. 61. 1-3, 63. 4, 53. 12, 57. 19 have been brought into the picture. Sirach has also linked Elijah with resurrection, although the text is too corrupt to detect a precise midrashic basis. From other sources it can be seen that this has developed from II Kings 2. 9 (Elijah's possession of the Spirit) which is linked with I Kings 17 (raising widow's son) and II Kings 5 (healing Naaman = raising the dead), and with the prophet Jonah. The Mishnaic passage (humility--Holy Spirit--resurrection--Elijah) also suggests that through the possession of the Spirit, Elijah can be brought into contexts which link Spirit possession with humility (Mekilta, Leviticus Rabbah-discussed more fully below). We have noted the tendency for Elijah to go in two directions--fiery judge ("historical section" of Sirach, Lives of the Prophets, John the Baptist's preaching) and restorer and peace bringer ("eschatological section" of Sirach, and the traditions which link Elijah with Phineas, Jonah and Isaiah). It might be noted that Malachi 3 and 4, which provide the starting point for much of the Elijah speculation, feed in both directions ("fire," "purification of temple," on the one hand, and "turning the hearts," and "messenger of covenant" = "covenant of peace," on the other). It seems clear to the present author that this early midrashic tradition about Elijah and the use of Elijah in Luke are similar and at certain

points strikingly so. It is necessary now to complete this study by focusing briefly upon Elisha and Isaiah the prophet.

#207. Elisha. --The sources for Elisha are much scantier than Elijah, for Elisha never became such an object of speculation. Sirach 48. 12-14, mentions that he was filled with Elijah's spirit (II Kings 2. 15), his independence toward rulers, his miracles and especially those connected with his corpse (II Kings 13. 20). This last item seems to reflect extra-biblical traditions, for the one miracle related in II Kings 13. 20 does not quite meet the statement of Sirach: "when he was dead his body prophesied." In the Lives of the Prophets, the briefest text mentions only a birth portent.[1] Expanded versions mention his "healing" of the spirit at Jericho[2] his raising of the dead and his healing of Naaman.[3] Other versions add mention of his receiving a double portion of Elijah's spirit, and the miracle connected with his corpse. In rabbinic writings, Elisha is often linked with Elijah as would be expected. In a passage in Leviticus Rabbah xxvii. 4 it is stated that "All that the Holy One, blessed be He, intends to perform... in the Time to Come

---

[1]Torrey, Lives, pp. 32, 48.

[2]Schermann, Propheten, p. 112.

[3]The language in this section shows a very close connection between raising the dead and cleansing of a leper, mentioned above, section #204. The text reads: "And he raised the dead. And Naaman the Syrian, who was a leper, he cleansed of his leprosy. And Gehazi, his servant, he caused to become leprous. And he raised a corpse which was dead" (kai nekros ōn nekron ēgeiren). This Greek looks like translation Greek from a Semitic language. One of the principles Torrey uses to distinguish the earliest text of the Lives from later additions is that the earliest sections are translation Greek from Hebrew while the additions are composed in Greek. The Elisha section appears to be an exception to this rule.

He has already partly performed... through the instrumentality of his righteous prophets."[1] Thus as for resurrection, "It has already occurred through Elijah, through Elisha and through Ezekiel." As for causing the blind to see, this has already been done through Elisha, for it says "And the Lord opened the eyes of the young man" (II Kings 6. 17). The rabbis frequently compare and contrast Elisha and Elijah in respect to their miracles, a task which is greatly aided by the fact that there are so many doublets within the Elijah-Elisha cycle itself. In the New Testament, Elisha is named only in Luke 4. 27. Some have suggested that he is in the background elsewhere: Jesus' first miracle at Cana is thought to reflect Elisha's first miracle, which is also a "water-miracle" (the well at Jericho). More likely is the suggestion that the synoptic feedings miracles may reflect Elisha's feeding of the one hundred (II Kings 4. 42-44). I have suggested above that the reference to the healing of lepers in Luke 7. 22 is an allusion to the healing of Naaman.[2] If this is so, in the light of the midrashic study done thus far, it would have to be understood as linked closely with Elijah through the categories of Spirit and resurrection.

#208. Isaiah the Prophet. --Once again, in comparison with Elijah, there is very little source material for a portrait of Isaiah in pre-Christian times. In his article, "A Study of the Relation of Isaiah to the Fourth Gospel," Franklin W. Young has tried to make the point that "in the pre-Christian period, the prophet Isaiah and his book played an influential role in Jewish

---

[1]Judah J. Slotki, trans., Midrash Rabbah; Leviticus (London: Soncino Press, 1939), p. 347.

[2]See section #106.

speculation."[1] Young draws upon Sirach 48. 22b-25, the Ascension of Isaiah (recognized to be largely Christian but possibly containing Jewish sources--especially the Martyrdom of Isaiah), the importance of the Book of Isaiah for the Qumran community, and the Lives of the Prophets, where there is a striking parallel to John 9. 7.[2] Young's conclusion is that Isaiah is "the prophet par excellance of the hidden mysteries of God." Young's study is oriented toward the Fourth Gospel, and especially the text in John 12. 41 -- "Isaiah said this because he saw his glory and spoke of him." For our purposes it can be pointed out that Sirach 48. 23-25 contains an allusion to Isaiah 61. 3--"he comforted those who mourn in Zion." This tallies with the Targum, which also understands this passage to refer to the prophet himself: "The prophet said, 'The spirit of prophecy from before the Lord Elohim is upon me...'[3] What neither Young, nor any other commentator has pointed out is that the Sirach text seems to have pulled together three Isaianic passages which are linked in Hebrew by Isaiah 61. 1. The Hebrew text of Sirach 48. 24-25 reads:

ברוח גבורה חזה אחרית
וינחם אבלי ציון
עד עולם הגיד נהיות
ונסתרות לפני בואן

The phrase ינחם אבלי ציון clearly comes from Is. 61. 3--lenahem kal ʾavelim; lasum la ʾaveley siyyon. In Is. 61. 1 it reads (ruah adonay

---

[1] ZNW, XLVI (1955), p. 221.

[2] Siloam ho hermeneuetai apestalmenos. See p. 250 above.

[3] Stenning, Targum Isaiah, p. 202.

yahweh ʿalay yaʿan mashaḥ adonai ʾothi. The words ברוח גבורה may be linked with Is. 11. 2--ruaḥ esah wugeburah. The same verse reads: wenaḥah ʿalaw ruaḥ adonai, which closely resembles Is. 61. 1--ruaḥ adonai ʿalay. The "hidden things" (נסתרות) which Sirach says Isaiah saw may be linked with Isaiah 45. 1-3, where God says to his anointed (limeshiḥo) that He will give to him "hidden treasures" (matmuney mistarim). The root mshḥ also occurs in Is. 61.1---cited above. It would be wrong to deduce from this that Sirach has seen in Isaiah the prophet a messianic figure. It does show that Sirach may be in touch with midrashic tradition concerning Isaiah the prophet and that Is. 61. 1 figures prominently in the midrash. [1]

#209. Isaiah 61. 1-3 in early midrashic traditions. --Here we shift the focus away from Elijah and Isaiah as prophetic figures toward this particular text. For convenience we may mention here that Is. 61. 1 has already been mentioned in connection with Elijah-Phineas, [2] the Mishnah (humility), [3] the section on the prophet Isaiah in Sirach 48. 25, just discussed, and the Beatitudes. [4] This last context may be pursued a bit farther. Doeve has argued that the first beatitude has been read off not only from Is. 61. 1 and 57. 15 but also Dan. 7, 14, 18. [5] There it is said that "one like a son of man" is given dominion (shaltan), glory (yeqar) and kingdom (malku). Then, the

---

[1]The Isaiah section in the Lives of the Prophets, while clearly reflecting on biblical passages as well as apocryphal traditions, knows nothing of this midrashic tradition.

[2]Section #200.

[3]Section #204.

[4]Sections #76 and #158.

[5]Doeve, Jewish Hermeneutics, pp. 155-158.

kingdom is given to "the saints of the Most High" (malkutha qaddishey ʿelyonin). Doeve argues that yeqar is closely related to shekinah, citing Targum Isaiah 6.5 where it speaks of "the glory of the Shekinah" (yaqer shakinath). This links Daniel 7.14 with Is. 57.15 where the shekinah is given to the humble. It also makes possible a link with Is. 61.1, because of the association of shekinah and ruah adonai. The midrash underlying the first three Beatitudes may thus be diagrammed as follows:

Is. 57.15	makarioi hoi ptōchoi tōi pneumati	Is. 61.1
Dan. 7.14--7.18	hoti autōn estin hē basileia tōn ouranōn	
	makarioi hoi penthountes	Is. 61.2
	hoti autoi paraklēthēsontai	
Is. 57.136 Is. 61.7	makarioi hoi praeis	
Ps. 37.11	hoti klēronomēsousin tēn gēn.	Is. 61.7

In this way, the following associations are set up:

Shekinah Is. 57.15)----"glory" (Dan. 7.14),

"inherit the land" (Is. 57.13b) (Is. 61.7) (Ps. 37.11) ----"receive the kingdom" (Dan. 7.18)

"poor" (Is. 61.1)
"contrite in spirit" (Is. 57.15) (Is. 61.1) ----"saints of the Most High" (Dan. 7.18)

I would suggest carrying this analysis just one step further. It may be that the phrase in Dan 7.13-- עֲנָנֵי שְׁמַיָּא could have been read, under the

influence of Is. 61. 1, as עֲנָוִי שְׁמַיָּא so that "the clouds of heaven" become "the humble of heaven." Then Dan. 7. 13 would be read to say that one like a son of man came with the humble of heaven to receive the kingdom, and this would parallel verse 18, with "the humble of heaven" = "the saints of the Most High" who receive the kingdom. And thus the first beatitude: "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."

#210. Mekilta Exodus 20. 21. --It will be recalled that Flusser linked the midrash lying behind the beatitudes with the Dead Sea Scrolls and also certain rabbinic traditions.[1] He refers to a passage in the Mekilta which has made use of a similar complex of Old Testament texts:

> But Moses drew near unto the thick darkness (Ex. 20. 21). What brough him this distinction? His meekness (ענותנותו). For it is said: "Now the man Moses was very meek (ענו ; Num. 12. 3). Scripture tells that whosoever is meek will cause the shekinah to dwell with man on earth, as it is said "For thus saith the High and Lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy: I dwell in the high and holy place with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit (Is. 57. 15). And it also says: The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the lord hath anointed me to bring good tidings unto the humble (Is. 61. 1).[2]

---

[1]Section #158.

[2]Jacob Z. Lauterbach, tr., Mekilta de - Rabbi Ishmael (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1949), II, p. 273. The full text is: ומשה נגש אל הערפל. מי גרם לו; ענותנותו. שנאמר והאיש משה ענו מאד. מגיד הכתוב שכל מי שהוא עניו סופו להשרות שכינה עם האדם בארץ. שנאמר כי כה אמר רם ונשא שוכן עד וקדוש שמו מרום וקדוש אשכון ואת דכא ושפל רוח. ואומר רוח יי אלהים עלי יען משח יי אותי לבשר ענוים.

This passage undoubtedly preserves some early exegetical traditions. The association of Ex. 20. 21 with Num. 12. 3 which links Moses' meekness with his ability to stand in the Divine Presence may already underlie Sir. 45. 4-5: en pistei kai prautēti auton (Moses) hēgiasen... kai eisēgagen auton eis ton gnophon. This midrash also rests upon an identification of shekinah with ruaḥ adonai and, like the midrash underlying the beatitudes, plays on the similarity between ʿani and ʿanaw. Is. 57. 15 plays an important part in the development of this midrash, I believe. There we read that God dwells with him "who is of a contrite and humble spirit" (ʾeth dakaʾ wushefal ruaḥ), "in order to revive the spirit of the humble and to revive the heart of the contrite," (lehahayoth ruaḥ shefalim wulehahayoth lev nidka im.) While the sense of this passage is probably that God revives the humble spirit by dwelling with it, the construction can give rise to the idea that the humble one with whom God dwells has the task of reviving the humble spirits of others.[1] This interpretation is all the more possible when this text is associated with Is. 61. 1, as it has been in the Mekilta. The lev nidkaʾim of 57. 15 tallies with the nishbere lev of Is. 61. 1. One thus comes to the interpretation that the one who announces good news to the ʿanawim is himself ʿanaw. It is also interesting to notice that the association of Spirit and resurrection which we have mentioned earlier is explicitly expressed in the Targum Is. 57. 15, which reads "for I am about to restore the spirits of the dead and the souls

---

[1]The Mekilta itself can be interpreted to be saying either that "whoever is meek ends by having the shekinah dwell with him on earth" (as Flusser takes it) or as Lauterbach translates, "will cause the shekinah to dwell with man on earth."

which I have made." This immediately brings to mind two interpretations of Isaiah 57. 19 which we have mentioned--"peace, peace to the far and to the near" interpreted in connection with Elijah's eschatological role in Mishnah, Eduyoth 8. 7, and in connection with the healing of the leper in Leviticus Rabbah xvi. 9. With the close association of both Elijah and the healing of leprosy with resurrection, one suspects a common midrashic tradition may underlie these various texts. It is interesting at this point also to call attention to the fact that the Targum Is. 57. 15-19 has consistently interpreted the "healing" of the Hebrew text as "forgiveness," and with that in mind to turn to Acts 2. 39 where there is an allusion to Isaiah 57. 19, brought into the context of forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit. [1]

#211. Leviticus Rabbah. --Another rabbinic passage which seems to stand in the same midrashic tradition is found in Leviticus Rabbah x. 2:

> 'And the Lord spoke unto Moses, saying: Take Aaron and his sons with him, and the garments, and the anointing oil... and Moses brought Aaron ... and anointed him' (Leviticus 8. 1-4). This is (an illustration of) the verse: 'Thou hast loved righteousness and hated wickedness; therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows. (Psalm 45. 8). ... R. Azariah, in the name of R. Judah ben Simeon, expounded the verse as referring to Isaiah. Isaiah said, I was at leisure at my house of study when I heard the voice of the Holy One, blessed be He, saying: 'Whom shall I send and who will go for us (Is. 6. 8)... Then I said: Here am I send me.' Said the Holy One, blessed be He, 'Isaiah, my children are troublesome, they are stubborn. If thou takest it upon thyself to be degraded and to be beaten by my children, thou art fit to go on my mission; if not, thou art not fit to go on my mission.' Isaiah replied, "(I am willing to go) on these conditions, 'I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair' (Is. 50. 6). Am I not fit then to go on a mission to Thy children?" Then said the Holy One, blessed be He, "Isaiah, 'Thou hast loved

---

[1] In rabbinic literature, Joel 3. 1-5 was associated with Ezek. 25-26 where the gift of spirit = sprinkling of clean water. Cf. baptism in Acts 2. 38.

> righteousness,' (meaning), thou hast loved to make my children righteous, 'And thou hast hated wickedness,' (meaning), thou hast hated condemning them as wicked. 'Therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.'" What is the meaning of 'Above thy fellows'? God said to Isaiah: "As thou livest, all the prophets received the gift of prophecy one from another," as it is said, 'And he took of the Spirit that was upon him and put it on the seventy elders..! (Num. 11. 25), and 'The spirit of Elijah doth rest of Elisha' (II Kings 2. 15), "but thou (hast received the gift of prophecy) from the mouth of the Holy One, blessed be he," as it is said, 'The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me' (Is. 61. 1). "As thou livest, whereas all prophets prophesied single words of comfort, thou shalt double words of cheer"; for instance 'Awake, awake,' (Is. 51. 9); 'Bestir thyself, bestir thyself' (50. 17); 'Rejoice, yea I will rejoice' (61. 10); 'I even I am he that comforteth you (51. 12); 'Comfort ye, comfort ye my people' (40. 1).[1]

When we analyze the midrash underlying this passage, we see that essentially, it has linked three passages by the root msḥ: Leviticus 8. 1-4, Ps. 45. 8 and Is. 61. 1. This is very similar to the midrash we have discussed in Sirach 48. 24-25, where several texts were related to Isaiah the prophet through the terms msḥ and ruaḥ. Leviticus 8. 2 is linked with Psalm 45. 8 and Is. 61. 1 also by means of the word shemen, and Psalm 45. 8 is closely related to Is. 61. 3 by the phrase shemen sason: Ps. 45. 8-- al ken mᵉshahaka ʾelohim ʾeloheka shemen sason mehabereka; Is. 61. 3--shemen sason tahath ʾevel maʿateh.[2] The assertion that Isaiah spoke "double words of cheer" may reflect Is. 61. 7--where the term mishneh-"double"--occurs twice! This would also create a link with II Kings 2. 9, where Elisha asks for a double (shenayim) portion of Elijah's spirit. The basic theme of this passage--that Isaiah's anointing by the Spirit leads him to a mission of humiliation and

---

[1]The English translation is that of J. Israelstam, Midrash Rabbah; Leviticus (London: Soncino Press, 1939), p. 122.

[2]The same link has been made in Hebrews 1. 9. See section #78 above.

rejection--shows some affinity with the Mekilta passage, which closely links Spirit and humility as well. It must be assumed, I think, that Is. 61. 1 carries with it into this passage strong associations of this kind in order for Ps. 45. 8 to be interpreted as it is: particularly that "hated wickedness" should come to mean here "hates to condemn his people as wicked and so is willing to embark on a mission which will end in his humiliation and abuse." This passage seems to be a much fuller elaboration of the implications of the Mekilta passage--that the one who preaches good news to the ʿanawim is himself ʿanaw. For our purpose it is significant that this passage, which appears to have a long exegetical tradition behind it which has some of its roots in Sirach 48, employs some of the same Old Testament passages we find in Luke and draws from them a very similar theme.

#212. Summary of Chapter Four. --In this chapter we have learned something about the synagogue homily and the midrashic exegesis which underlies it, and while the study of the New Testament cannot proceed on the assumption that we can reconstruct the lectionary background of the synagogue, this excursus has nevertheless opened up the richness and complexity and potential fruitfulness of Jewish scriptural interpretation as a background for the NT. The study of early midrashic traditions related to Elijah has revealed that in New Testament times there was undoubtedly a "theology of Elijah" which was developed, particularly in reference to Elijah's "eschatological" role, through the association of texts. The development of a "gracious" Elijah who, in contrast to his stern and zealous nature as a prophet, returns to bring about reconciliation, forgiveness and resurrection, is accomplished in part by the use of Isaianic texts, including Is. 61. 1. This

gives a further basis for the possibility mentioned earlier that an exegetical tradition lies behind the association of Is. 61. 1 and Elijah in Lk. 4. 18-19; 24-25. A study of the early exegesis of Is. 61. 1ff shows it to have been a popular text and that probably already in Sirach it has been drawn into a midrash on the word msh in relation to the figure of the prophet Isaiah. Similarly it is drawn into texts dealing with the motif of Spirit, and within this orbit the themes of Spirit, resurrection and forgiveness (Targum Is. 57. 19) are developed. The portrait of Isaiah in Lev. Rab. is that of one who sees ahead to the last days in the specific sense of knowing that his mission to Israel will mean humiliation and rejection; yet he goes to speak words of comfort--one could almost say of forgiveness--and this is all taken as the meaning of his anointing with the Spirit. It is with these themes and insights in mind that we return to the question of Luke's interpretation of Is. 61. 1ff.

CHAPTER V

THE INTERPRETATION OF ISAIAH 61. 1-2 IN THE GOSPEL OF LUKE

The Programmatic Nature of Isaiah 61. 1-2

#213. Some fairly obvious themes. --In answer to the question raised earlier as to how literally Luke sees the phrases in Is. 61. 1-2 actually fulfilled in specific acts of Jesus' ministry, it can be said that while he seems to have drawn many nuances of meaning from the text, he has not taken pains to do this in a mechanically literal way. That is, every phrase in the quotation can be linked up with another passage in the Gospel, but the link is not always obvious. Our task in this chapter is to briefly point out the more obvious links and then go on at greater length to explore the less obvious ones. Let it be clear that we are concerned with the question of what Luke means by the terms ptōchoi, aichmalōtoi, typhloi, tethrausmenoi. Are these only vague metaphors? Or do they have for Luke a more specific meaning? Do they suggest for him specific groups of people? And do these terms have significance only for Jesus' ministry or do they reach beyond to the post-resurrection period? It seems pretty clear that these are more than vague metaphors for Luke. The term aichmalōtoi is probably understood by him as a reference to those in bondage to Satan and more specifically, the ill. That the term could be used in this connection is illustrated in Tatian, Oration to the Greeks, xviii--"The demons do not cure but by their art make men their captives" (ou therapeuousin hoi daimones, technēi de tous anthropous aichmatoteuousi).

The context makes clear that illness is meant.[1] Thus all of the healings, and especially the demon expulsions, could be illustrations for Luke of this particular phrase. Lk. 13.16 reflects the imagery of illness as a "binding by Satan" very explicitly. A lame woman is called a daughter of Abraham hēn edesen ho satanas and her cure on the sabbath is compared with the untying of an ox on the sabbath, so her cure is explicitly a "loosing." This is a fairly obvious link with kēruxai aichmalōtois aphesin. As for the blind, Luke has no narrative of the healing of a blind man (Mk. 8.22-26 falls in the "great omission") but in 7.21 he somewhat abruptly introduces the phrase "and to many blind he granted sight" just before the answer to John the Baptist.[2] The word thrauein is found only here in Luke-Acts, but there is evidence that Luke has given it some attention. Both the narrative of the sinful woman (7.48-50)

---

[1]A similar use of the term is found in Test. Daniel 5.10-"those taken captive by Beliar..." (καὶ τὴν αἰχ. λήφεται ἀπὸ τοῦ Βελιάρ).

[2]A question related to the one under discussion is: has Luke been careful to provide an illustration of each of the healings mentioned in Lk. 7.22? P. Schubert, ZNW, p. 180 believes that Luke has not been as careful as Matthew. Before Mt. 11.5 there is a healing of the blind (9.27-31), lame (5.17-26), leper (5.12-14), dumb (9.32-34), dead raised (9.18-26), and the poor hear the gospel (5.3; 11.28-30). Before Luke 7.22 there is the healing of the blind (7.21), lame (5.17-26), leper (5.12-14), dead raised (7.11-15), and poor hear the gospel (6.20ff), but no explicit mention of the kōphoi before 7.22 although in 11.14 a dumb (kōphos) man is healed. However neither Mt. nor Lk. have been perfectly careful because in both it is said explicitly that the kōphon spirit is a dumb spirit, for when it is cast out, the man begins to speak, which does not answer perfectly to the phrase kōphoi akouousin. Of course deafness and dumbness were known to be related, as the use of kōphos for both maladies indicates, (Finkel appeals to the rabbis where the relation is explicitly stated). Thus Schubert has made the contrast too sharply. The only difference between Matthew and Luke on this point is that Luke has the healing of a dumb spirit after Jesus' answer to John.

and the healing of the paralytic (5. 24) provide instances of those who are "sent forth in forgiveness." In section #50 above we anticipated another possibility--that Luke has linked Is. 61. 1 and 58. 6 with Deut. 20. 3-5, where the tethrausmenoi are those who "tremble" before the "enemy." The Deuteronomy passage deals with preparations for the holy war, which Luke could have taken to mean as the battle between Christ and Satan, so that the tethrausmenoi are again those in bondage to Satan, the ill. This would make keruxai aichmalōtois aphesin and aposteilai tethrausmenous en aphesei quite parallel in meaning. That Luke intends them to be parallel is supported by an analysis of the opening verses of the Nazareth pericope by Lund who has shown them to have a perfect chiastic structure.[1] He lays these verses out in the following way:

And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up
And he entered as his custom was on the sabbath day into the synagogue
And stood up to read.
A And there was given to him the book of the prophet Isaiah
He opened the book and found the place where it was written

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me,
Because he has anointed me to preach good news to the poor
He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives
B And recovering the sight to the blind,
To send forth the oppressed in release
To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord

And he closed the book
A' And gave it back to the attendant
And sat down
And the eyes of all in the synagogue were fixed on him

---

[1]Nils Wilhelm Lund, Chiasmus in the New Testament (Chapel Hill, North Carolina, University of N.C. Press, 1942), p. 236.

This arrangement helps to explain certain features of the quotation. The phrase from Is. 58.6 is a good parallel to keruxai aichmalōtois ktl.. Its position is in the interest of chiasmus. This may also explain why one phrase from Is. 61.1 is dropped out--it would destroy this chiastic structure. The change from kalesai to keruxai in the last line also makes a better parallel to euaggelisasthai, and the quotation begins and ends with mention of the kyrios. To complete the line with mention of vengeance would clearly also destroy the parallelism. So Lund may have the best explanation of the form of the quotation. And if we accept his view, we can see that the middle lines--the bound, the blind and the oppressed--all refer to the healing of the sick who are understood as under the power of Satan. This arrangement also suggests that "good news to the poor" and "the acceptable year of the Lord" are parallel, which leads us to explore the meaning of the term ptōchos. Here we are faced with a more complex situation, for Luke uses the term ptōchos in various contexts. My study along this line has uncovered a midrash on the LXX Is. 61.1-6 which Luke has apparently carried out in the effort to bring forth as much meaning from this text as possible. Through a reconstruction of this midrash we are led into an entirely new dimension of its meaning for Luke which is not obvious but is nevertheless an important aspect of his thought which we can see reflected in many places in the Gospel and Acts. We turn now to a study of this midrash and will return to the question of the meaning of the term ptōchos in sections #224 and #243.

Luke's Isaiah Midrash

#214. The technique of "enriching" Is. 61.1-2. --In sections #8 and

#24 above, M. Gertner's study of midrashic methods underlying the New Testament is summarized.[1] Among other techniques he mentions that of "enriching" a text, i. e. putting one scriptural passage alongside another and interpreting them in the light of each other. We have seen several instances of this technique in chapter iv. Here we proceed on the hypothesis that Luke is acquainted with this type of exegesis and has used it to interpret Is. 61. 1-2. A few words need to be said about the way in which one should proceed with such a hypothesis. For one thing, it does not commit us to the view that Luke has worked in a Semitic language. This particular technique can be used quite well in the Septuagint, and the Pauline epistles give us many instances of the conjunction of Old Testament passages in a way that reveals that they have been read in the light of each other and thus given a meaning they would not have alone. Of all the rabbinic techniques this one would be the most usable for the Hellenistic Jew, for most of these techniques exploit features peculiar to Semitic language. This does not mean that we are ruling out the possibility that Luke has worked in a Semitic tongue; we are leaving that question open and trusting it to those better equipped to work with it. Here we will see the possibilities open to Luke within the Septuagint. We know from Lk. 4. 18-19 that Is. 61. 1-2 and Is. 58. 6 have been conflated. Thus we may assume that Luke has deliberately associated them in his mind. If we look to the context of the quoted material we find in Is. 61. 6 a reference to those who will "eat the wealth of nations" (ischun ethnōn katedesthe). In

---

[1]Note particularly Gertner's thesis that Luke has "enriched" the meaning of the term "face" by linking Gen. 24. 20 and Is. 40. 3.

Is. 58.7 we read "share your bread with the hungry and bring the homeless poor into your house" (diathrupte peinōnti ton arton sou kai ptōchous astegous eisage eis ton oikon sou). The former passage (Is. 61.6) could be construed by one who was looking for it as an allusion to the messianic banquet. The passage is constructed in such a way that the groups addressed in vss. 1-3 can be understood as the subjects of the verb katedesthe which gives rise to the image of the poor, the blind, the bound and oppressed, the mourners--joining in a banquet. It also creates a link with the demand in Is. 58.7 to share one's bread with the "homeless poor." By the technique of enriching, Is. 58.6-7, which in its own context is an exhortation to social justice, becomes material to fill out the meaning of the allusion to the messianic banquet in Is. 61.6. In this way, the phrase "good news to the poor" comes to have very concrete meaning, and at the same time takes on the connotations of the messianic banquet. The anointed prophet is sent by God to announce the eschatological banquet at which will be included the poor, the blind, the sick, the mournful.

#215. The "enrichment" of Is. 61.1-2 in Luke 6.20-26. --There is supporting evidence that Luke has interpreted Is. 61.1-2 within the context of the messianic banquet in the Blessings and Woes which are his version of the Beatitudes of Matthew. There the poor (6.20) are associated with the hungry (6.21) and those who weep (6.22), a combination which can be seen in the conjunction of Is. 61.1-2 and 58.6. To these Isaianic texts has been added another: Is. 65.13-14, which seems particularly to have suggested the

contrast between blessing and woe:[1]

Is. 65. 13-14	Lk. 6. 20-26
idou hoi douleuontes moi phagontai hymeis de peinasete	makarioi hoi peinontes nun hoti chortasthēsesthe
idou hoi douleuontes moi piontai hymeis de dipsēsete	ouai hymin hoi empeplēsmenoi hoti peinasete
idou hoi douleuontes moi euphranthesonta hymeis de aischunthēsesthe	makarioi hoi klaiontes nun hoti gelasete
idou hoi douleuontes moi agalliasontai en euphronsunei hymeis de kekraxesthe dia ponon tēs kardias hymōn kai apo suntribēs pneumatos ololuxete	ouai hoi gelōntes nun hoti penthēsete kai klausete
kataleipsete gar to onoma hymōn eis plēsmonēn tois eklektois mou	ekbalosin to onoma hymōn hōs ponēron.

These texts are held together by the theme of the messianic banquet, which is promised to those who are poor and hungry now. Thus we have in Lk. 6. 20-26 a clear indication that Luke has juxtaposed Isaianic texts, that Is. 61. 1-2 plays an important part in these associations, and that Is. 61. 1-2 has been interpreted as an allusion to the messianic banquet.

#216. Isaiah 25. 2-9. --This line of thought brings to mind another Isaianic passage which particularly in the LXX has several features in

---

[1]Cf. W. Grundmann, Das Evangelium nach Lukas, p. 145: "Der Gegensatz zwischen den Seliggepriesenen und denen, denen die Weherufe gelten, ist durch Is. 65. 13f. bestimmt."

in common with Is. 61. 1-6 and 58. 6-7. The text reads:[1]

2 ὅτι ἔθηκας πόλεις εἰς χῶμα, πόλεις ὀχυρὰς τοῦ πεσεῖν
αὐτῶν τὰ θεμέλια· τῶν ἀσεβῶν πόλις εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα
οὐ μὴ οἰκοδομηθῇ. 3διὰ τοῦτο εὐλογήσει σε ὁ λαὸς
ὁ πτωχός, καὶ πόλεις ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων εὐλογήσουσί
σε· 4ἐγένου γὰρ πάσῃ πόλει ταπεινῇ βοηθὸς καὶ τοῖς
ἀθυμήσασι δι'ἔνδειαν σκέπη, ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων πονηρῶν
ῥύσῃ αὐτούς, σκέπη διφώντων καὶ πνεῦμα ἀνθρώπων
ἀδικουμένων. 5ὡς ἄνθρωποι ὀλιγόφυχοι διφῶντες ἐν
Σιων ἀπὸ ἀνθρῶπων ἀσεβῶν, οἷς ἡμᾶς παρέδωκας. 6καὶ
ποιήσει κύριος σαβαωθ πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος
τοῦτο. πίονται εὐφροσύνην, πίονται οἶνον, 7χρίσονται
μύρον ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ. παράδος ταῦτα πάντα τοῖς
ἔθνεσιν ἡ γὰρ βουλὴ αὕτη επὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. 8κατέπιεν
ὁ θάνατος ἰσχύσας, καὶ πάλιν ἀφεῖλεν ὁ θεὸς πᾶν
δάκρυον ἀπὸ παντὸς προσώπου· τὸ ὄνειδος τοῦ λαοῦ
ἀφεῖλεν ἀπὸ πάσης τῆς γῆς, τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου
ἐλάλησε. 9καὶ ἐροῦσι τῇ ἡμέρα ἐκείνῃ Ἰδοὺ ὁ θεὸς
ἡμῶν, ἐφ'ᾧ ἠλπίζομεν καὶ ἠγαλλιώμεθα ἐπὶ τῇ σωτηρία
ἡμῶν. ὅτι ἀνάπαυσιν δώσει ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος τοῦτο..

---

[1]The Greek text is that printed by Joseph Ziegler, Isaias ("Septuaginta; Vetus Testamentum Graecum," Vol. XIV; Gottingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1939), p. 207.

> Because you have laid cities to ruin, strong cities whose foundations have fallen (a city of impious men cannot be built to last forever), therefore the poor people will bless you and cities of injured men will praise you. For in every humble city you have been a help and a shelter to those who are fainthearted because of poverty. You will save them from wicked men, you who are a shelter for the thirsty and a breath for injured men. /We are/ as fainthearted men thirsting in Zion because of impious men to whom you have delivered us. And the Lord of Hosts will make ready for all the nations upon this mountain. They will drink gladness, they will drink wine, they will be anointed with oil, on this mountain. Deliver all these things to the nations, for this is /his/ will for all the nations. Mighty death had swallowed /them/ up, and again the Lord wiped every tear from every face; he removed the reproach of his people from all the earth, for the mouth of the Lord has spoken. And in that day they will say, 'Behold our God in whom we hoped and we rejoice in our salvation.' For God shall give rest upon this mountain.

There are several verbal links between Is. 25. 2-9 and Is. 61. 1-6 and 58. 6-8:

Isaiah 25	Isaiah 58	Isaiah 61
v3-ptōchos	v7-ptōchous	v1-ptōchois
v4-tapeinos	v5-tapeinoun	
v4-pneuma		v1-pneuma
v6-euphrosynē		v2-euphrosynēs
v6-chrisontai		v1-echrise
v5-dipsōntōn dipsōntes	v6-peinōnti	
v6-myron		v3-aleimma
vv6, 7, 10-oros	v7-oikos	
v8-apheilen ho theos pan dakryon apo pantos prosōpou		v3-parakalesai pantas tous penthountas
v6-ethnesin		v6-ethnōn
v6-piontai v8-katepien		v6-katedesthe

To the imagery of the messianic banquet in Is. 61. 1-6 and 58. 6-7, Is. 25 adds the calling of the nations to the banquet (which can be linked with "eating the wealth of nations" in 61. 6), it suggests that the banquet is prepared after a time of suffering and persecution, and it supports the themes that it is God who calls the banquet, that the "injured" (adikoumenos) are among those present (which may be linked with the blind in Is. 61. 2) and that there will be comfort given at the banquet. It also suggests an identification of God's mountain (oros) with his house (oikos), both terms being used in the LXX as designations for the temple at Jerusalem. This last point suggests another Isaianic text which Luke has used in 19. 46 in connection with the temple: Is. 56. 4-7. Again, there are several verbal links to be seen among these passages:

Is. 56	Is. 25	Is. 58	Is. 61
v5-dektai		v5-dektēn	v2-dektos
v6-allogenesi			v5-allogeneis
v7-oikos		v7-oikos	
v7-oros hagion	vv6, 7, 10-oros		
v7-euphrano	v6-euphrosunē		v2-euphrosunēs
v7-ta ethnē	vv6, 7-ta ethnē		v6-ethnōn
v9-phagete	v6-piontai v8-katepien	v7-diathrupte ton arton sou	v6-katedesthe

The passage is addressed to those normally excluded from the community: strangers and eunuchs. But here they are not only called into God's house (mountain) but they are given there a special place (topon onomoston) which is said to be "better than /that of my/ sons and daughters" (kreissōn huiōn kai

thygaterōn), a phrase which a Christian exegete might well ponder. Although there is no banquet as such in Is. 56, a form of the word phagō does occur in the context, which is all an exegete needs to establish a link, as the study of Jewish homilies shows (see section #181-187 above). If these passages are all used to enrich each other, and to develop an image of the messianic banquet which is particularly designed to deal with the question of the relation of Israel to the Gentile nations, we begin to come very close to Luke's parable of the Great Feast in Lk. 14. 16-24. It is our thesis that behind this parable lies just such a messianic banquet midrash which has its origins in Is. 61. 1-6 and other Isaianic passages.

The Parable of the Great Feast

Problems of Interpretation

#217. Parable or allegory?--Luke gives us two banquet parables in 14. 7-14 and 15-24. The first of these contains some sayings for which there are parallels in the other Gospels, [1] but the pericope as a whole is peculiar to Luke. The second has a rough parallel in Mt. 22. 1-14, but a comparison shows many points of difference. Luke is much less heavy-handed; there are no servants killed, no city destroyed by an angry king, no bewildered wedding-guest thrown out because of improper dress. Moreover, the Lukan parable in 15-24 is introduced on an eschatological note: "Happy is he who will eat bread in the kingdom of God." This marks the second parable off

---

[1]The saying "For every one who exalts himself will be humbled and he who humbles himself will be exalted" has a parallel in Mt. 18. 4, 23. 12 and occurs again at Lk. 18. 14. The sayings on places of honor have a parallel in some Mss. of Mt. 20. 28 (D it vg sy^c) in a slightly different form.

from the first and establishes a link with Lk. 13. 29 (Mt. 8. 12) where there is another allusion to the messianic banquet in a highly polemical context. Taken together, these passages pose one of the most complex problems of Synoptic relationships. These sayings and parables appear to have been brought into this context in Luke under the general rubric of banquets, for 14. 1 finds Jesus dining at the house of a ruler who is a Pharisee. Vs. 7 is so constructed as to be aimed directly at guests who were present with Jesus and had chosen a place of honor, and the first parable of the banquet is directed to Jesus' host (vs. 12). The point of this parable, or saying, is quite simple: it revolves around a contrast between rich and poor, those who can repay a kindness and those who cannot. The one who invites to his dinner those who cannot repay will be repaid in the resurrection of the just. The same principle has been expressed in Luke 6. 35: "do good... expecting nothing in return, and your reward will be great." To this advice one can find many rabbinic parallels, e. g. Aboth 1. 5: "Jose b. Johanan of Jerusalem said: 'Let thy house be opened wide; and let poor folk be thy household.'" All such advice may well be nothing more than commentary upon Deut. 15. 10--"give to him (the poor) freely, and the Lord God will bless you in all your work." the phrase "the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind (ptōchous, anapērous, chōlous, typhlous)" does not here seem to have any significance beyond the obvious fact that all these are persons who could not repay a dinner invitation. Thus, vss. 12-13 are good examples of Jewish ethics. [1] Bultmann regards the

---

[1] I cannot understand why Bultmann regards these verses as being closer to the atmosphere of the final chapters of Enoch than to the message of Jesus (History, p. 108).

second parable (16-24) and its Matthean parallel to be allegorizations of an original parable the point of which is now lost to us.[1] This may be true for Matthew, but "allegorization" is probably not the most precise term with which to explain the Lukan text. We are accustomed to working mainly with two categories: parable and allegory. C. H. Dodd has laid down some criteria for each.[2] Most interpreters see Lk. 14. 16-24 falling somewhere between these two categories. It shows an "allegorizing tendency."[3] Perhaps

---

[1]History, p. 189. Bultmann regards all allegorical elements as secondary. But it is hard to imagine any Ur-form of this parable that would not be a simple allegory. Common to both versions are these elements: someone holds a feast; guests are notified through a servant(s); these guests refuse to come, mainly for business reasons; their refusal angers the host and he throws the feast open to anyone; these fill up the house and those who refused are condemned. These groups must have referred to someone, although it is true that one cannot be too quick in saying exactly who is meant. But in contrast to the first Lukan parable (7-14) this "simple" form of the second parable already seems to have some kind of symbolic meaning. Our point is that whatever the original parable may have been, Luke has developed in a way quite different from Matthew and primarily along lines of Old Testament interpretation.

[2]Parables of the Kingdom (Fontana Books, 1961), p. 18. A parable "presents one simple point of comparison" whereas in allegory "each detail is a separate metaphor with a significance of its own." Thus the details in a parable serve to build up a total picture. Moreover, allegory tends to strain reality. Rom. 11. 16-24, for example: lopped off branches are not normally saved to be grafted in later! Whereas in a parable "all is true to nature and to life." Dodd's view of Lk. 14. 15-24 is that it reveals the interests of the early church; the plateias kai hrymas are city streets, the hodous kai phragmous are farther outside, suggesting the extension of the gospel to the Gentiles.

[3]Cf. Francis W. Beare, "The Parable of the Guests at the Banquet: A Sketch of the History of its Interpretation," The Joy of Study; Papers on New Testament and Related Subjects Presented to Honor Frederick Clifton Grant, ed. Sherman E. Johnson (New York: Macmillan Co., 1951), pp. 1-14. Beare says that since the time of Julicher's Die Gleichnisreden Jesu, most commentators have agreed that even the Lucan form has introduced meanings that did not belong to the story originally told by Jesus, but these are more prominent in Matthew where the parable has been conflated with at least one, perhaps two, other parables. In the early church the parable was, of course, fully allegorized. The phrase "compel them to come in" was used by Augustine as

we can make this more precise. Our view is that this parable reflects a Septuagint midrash on Is. 61. 1-6. The parable itself is not a midrash, but details of it reflect a midrashic study of the messianic banquet theme in Isaiah.

The Parable and the Banquet Midrash

#218. The Isaianic character of Luke's special material. --Comparison of the Lukan material in the parable to the banquet midrash developed above shows many points of contact. The oikodespotēs of the parable corresponds to God who prepares a feast on his mountain (= house). He sends out his servant to bring in the guests (the speaker in Is. 61. 1-6 who is sent with good news to the poor). The servant brings in the poor, the injured, the blind and the lame, corresponding to the groups mentioned in Is. 61. 1, 58. 6 and 25. 3.

---

support for the Donatist persecution and with this Calvin concurred in his own day. There is no mention in Beare's article of the possibility of a midrashic basis for the Lukan form. Beare sees in the doubling of the slave's mission to summon other guests a reflection of Luke's conception of the stages in the preaching of the gospel. The excuses offered, he feels, do not really apply only to the leaders of Judaism, Pharisees and scribes, and must be meant to warn against a more general absorption in the affairs of the world. A very different view is taken by Eta Linnemann, "Uberlegungen zur Parabel vom grossen Abendmahl; Lk. 14. 15-24/Mt. 22. 1-4," ZNW, Vol. LI (1960), pp. 246-255, who argues that the Lukan version is not an allegorical expansion of an authentic parable of Jesus but is itself the original form, and that the guests are not giving absolute excuses from the meal but only requesting that they be allowed to come late; the point of filling up the house, therefore, is to fill all the seats before these invited guests return; thus verse 24 is the point of the whole parable--those who come late will not get in. The parable is told in response to the Pharisee who says--"Blessed is he who shall eat bread in the kingdom of God." The answer of Jesus is, in effect, "If you don't come in now, you will not get in then." It is also argued that the third excuse--"I have a wife"--is a later addition (it lacks the excuse formula which is repeated with the two first excuses, and also betrays an historically later interest)--a necessary conclusion because the third man says quite explicitly that he cannot come at all. (This means that by the time this third excuse is added, the original point of the parable as interpreted by Linnemann has already been forgotten). There are attractive features to this view, but I have preferred to put the parable in the context of the thought of Luke, with the presupposition that the material peculiar to him is his own.

He is sent again to more distant places, corresponding to the coming of the nations in Is. 25.7 and strangers and nations in 56.3 and 7. These are given a place in God's house (Is. 56.5) which is "better than [that of my] sons and daughters"--alluding to those originally invited to the banquet who have refused. When we pursue this line of inquiry we come to two conclusions: (1) the Lukan parable is dominantly Isaianic in vocabulary; (2) the Isaianic passages in which we find parallels of words and phrases to the parable are linked verbally by the mention of eating and drinking and many other related themes. This evidence is set forth below in three sections. First, the vocabulary of vss. 21-22 of the parable is illustrated from Isaiah; second, a chart shows the verbal relations between the Isaianic passages mentioned in the first part; third, the allusions to a "banquet" are lifted out for special attention.

#219. Isaianic vocabulary. --

21...tote orgistheis ho oikodespotēs... God is called despotēs three times in Isaiah 1.24; 3.10 and 10.33. In Is. 5.26, God becomes angry (ōrgisthē thumō) with his people in the wake of which he summons the nations from the ends of the earth to an implied banquet for in the LXX it says.."and they shall not hunger.."(vs. 27).

...eipen to$_i$ doulo$_i$ autou... In Isaiah 49.9 God summons those who are in bonds and in darkness to a feast through his servant (doulos).

...exelthe tacheōs... In Is. 5.26 God summons the nations to come quickly (tachu kouphōs).

...eis tas plateias kai hrumas tēs poleōs... The conjunction of plateias and hrumas is found in Is. 15.3. Is. 25.3, 4 (LXX) mentions cities of

injured men, a city of a poor people and a "humble" city which are invited to a feast on God's mountain.

...kai tous ptōchous... Is. 58.6 admonishes that the fast which is acceptable to God is to invite the homeless poor into one's house to share bread with them. Is. 61.1 speaks of "good news to the poor" (quoted and conflated with Is. 58.6 in Lk. 4.18) and Is. 25.3 of a feast prepared for poor men along with the nations.

...kai typhlous kai chōlous... The blind are linked with the poor in Is. 61.1 and with the lame in 35.5 and 29.18.

...eisagage hote... Is. 58.7 exhorts one to lead (eisage) the poor into one's house.

22...kai eipen ho doulos· kyrie, gegonen ho epetaxas kai eti topos estin... Is. 56.5 speaks of a place (topos) within God's house which is "better than ⌈that of my⌋ sons and daughters."

...exelthe eis tas hodous... The term hodous is of course very common but occurs in the context of an implied feast at 5.25 and 49.11 and 13.

...kai phragmous... This term occurs at 58.12.

...kai anagkason eiselthein hina gemisthē mou ho oikos... The term oikos occurs in conjunction with a banquet in 56.7; 58.7; 65.21 and 66.1.

	Isaiah 5	Isaiah 11	Isaiah 25	Isaiah 29 + 35	Isaiah 49	Isaiah 56	Isaiah 58	Isaiah 61	Isaiah 65-66
"Banquet" Theme	v.26 ou peinasousin	v.7 leōn kai bous phagontai	v.5 dipsōntōn dipsontes v.6 piontai	35.1,7 dipsōsa dipsōsei dipsōsan	v.9 bosnēthēsontai v.10 ou peinasousin oude dipsēsousin	v.9 phagete	v.6 arton peinōnti	v.6 katesthiō	v.21 phagontai v.25 leōn hōs bous phagetai
"Poor"		v.4 tapeinos	v.4 tapeinos ptōchos	29.19 ptōchoi	v.13 tapeinous		v.5 tapeinoun v.7 ptōchous	v.1 ptōchois	66.3 tapeinoun
"Joy"			v.6 euphrosyne v.8 aphaileu pan dakryon v.9 egalliōmetha	35.4 euphrosynēs 35.1 agalliasontai	v.13 euphrainesthe v.10 parakalesei	v.7 euphranō	v.6 aphesei	v.2 euphrosynēs parakalusai penthountas v.2 aphesin	65.25 orei hagiō mou
"mountain" "house"	v.25 oros	v.9 oros hagion	vv.6,7,10 oros	29.17 oros	v.11 oros	v.7 oros hagion v.7 oikos	v.7 oikos		65.21; 66.1 oikos
"Gentiles"	v.25 laos ta ethnē	vv.10,11 laos ta ethnē	vv.6,7 laos ta ethnē		v.6 phōs ethnōn	v.7 ta ethnē vv.3,6 allogenēs allogenasi		v.6 ethnōn v.5 allogeneis	
"Dispersion"		v.12 diasperamenous			v.6 diasperan	v.8 diasperamenous			
Other		v.2 pneuma theou	v.4 pneuma v.6 chrisontai myron		v.8 dektō kairō	v.7 dektai	v.5 dektōn hēmeran	v.1 pneuma Kyriou v.2 dektos hēmeran v.1 echrisen eleimmai	

#221. The "banquet" midrash. --In all these passages there is mention of a feast, eating, satisfaction of hunger or thirst. We have already discussed at some length Is. 61. 6; 58. 6-7; 25. 6ff. and 65. 13-14. Is. 5. 27 says that the nations summoned by God from afar "will not hunger" (ou peinasousin--only in LXX). In Is. 11. 7, the animals eat together on God's holy mountain. A doublet to this passage is found in 65. 25. Another allusion to animals eating is in 56. 9, but with entirely different meaning. In Is. 49. 9-10 there is an image of redeemed peoples feeding upon the mountains, no longer hungry and thirsty. Is. 35. 1 and 7 speak of the abundance of water for the thirsty. We seem to have here most of the Isaianic passages which describe or allude to a banquet prepared by God for the oppressed, the exiled, the outcast and the nations of the world. It has always been known that Luke is particularly interested in the theme of eating and drinking. The combination "eating and drinking" occurs ten times in the Gospel in passages peculiar to Luke.[1] Of these, 5. 30, 33; 7. 33, 34; 10. 7; 22. 30 are of importance for Luke's conception of Jesus' ministry. Moreover, many of Jesus' discourses are set in the context of a banquet, and the parables also play upon the theme, e. g. the Prodigal Son. To this obvious interest we are adding the not-so-obvious interest of Luke in the Old Testament allusions to banquets, particularly those of a prophetic nature. He seems to have sought out these texts and studied their contexts in the search for clues to the understanding of his own time. For example, Is. 5. 24, adds to the setting of a feast the detail of God's anger

---

[1]Lk. 5. 30, 33; 7. 33, 34, 13. 26; 10. 7; 12. 19, 29, 45; 17. 8-9, 27-28; 22. 30.

against his people, in the wake of which he quickly summons the nations from the ends of the earth. We can imagine how such a text would interest a Christian exegete of the first century. It is such details that Luke has woven into his version of the banquet parable. But this becomes even more apparent when we extend our reconstruction of this banquet midrash to another OT text.

#222. Deuteronomy 20. 5-7. --There is another OT passage which is closely related to Isaiah which provides a parallel to the excuses offered by the invited guests: Deut. 20. 5ff, which is linked with Is. 65. 21-66. 2. We have seen already that Is. 65. 13-14 has shaped the Lukan Blessings and Woes in 6. 20-26. Is. 66. 1 has been employed in Acts 7. 49-50 in connection with the temple--a fact which will receive further discussion below. Furthermore, Is. 65. 22 is linked verbally with the key text in Luke's midrash: Is. 61. Is. 61. 5 reads--"strangers shall feed your flocks and sons of foreigners shall be your vinedressers" (kai hēxousin allogeneis poimainontes ta probata sou, kai allophuloi arotēres kai ampelourgoi). It is similar to Is. 65. 22, with which it is linked verbally by common reference to "vineyard"--"and they will plant vineyards and eat their fruit themselves. And they will not build and others inhabit; and they will not plant and others eat" (kai kataphyteusousin ampelōnas kai autoi phagontai ta genēmata autōn. kai ou mē oikodomēsousin kai alloi enoikēsousin, kai ou mē phyteusousin kai alloi phagontai). If we can imagine Luke linking these two texts and interpreting them in relation to the messianic banquet, we can see that 65. 22 could mean to Luke that the Jews will not be robbed of their place in the messianic banquet by others--i. e. by Gentiles, and that

61.5 could mean to him that the Jews will actually be served by Gentiles. Deut. 20.5-7 is closely related to Is. 65.22 in its theme and vocabulary. The context is preparations for the "holy war," a theme which as we have already mentioned, could be transformed by Luke into the eschatological battle between God and Satan which characterizes the post-ressurection period.[1] Those who for one reason or another are "bad risks" in battle, who might "tremble" before the enemy, are weeded out with this exhortation:

> tis ho anthrōpos ho oikodomēsas oikian kainēn kai ouk enekainisen autēn; poreuesthō kai apostraphētō eis tēn oikian autou, mē apothanē$_i$ en tō$_i$ polemō$_i$ kai anthrōpos heteros egkainiei autēn. kai tis ho anthrōpos hostis ephyteusen ampelōna kai ouk euphranthē ex autou; poreuesthō... heteros euphranthēsetai ex autou. kai tis ho anthrōpos hostis memnēsteutai gunaika kai ouk elaben autēn... heteros lēmpsetai autēn.
>
> What man is there that has built a new house and has not dedicated it? Let him go and return to his house, lest he die in the war and another man dedicate it. And what man is there who has planted a vineyard and has not enjoyed it? Let him go back.. lest another enjoy it. And what man is there who has betrothed a wife and has not taken her? Let him go back ... lest another take her.

This may be compared with the excuses of the invited guests in Lk. 14.18-19:

> I have bought a field (agron ēgorasa) and I must go out and see it...
>
> I have bought five yoke of oxen (boōn) and I go to examine them
>
> I have married a wife (gunaika egēma) and therefore I cannot come.

Not only is there in each case three excuses, but they compare closely on two

---

[1]See section #213.

counts.[1] That they do not correspond exactly may mean that this passage has been conflated with another tradition.[2] What would this Deuteronomy

---

[1]It is remotely possible that the "oxen" are suggested to Luke by Is. 65. 25, where the bous is mentioned.

[2]There is considerable variation at this point in the traditions. Matthew has simply: "they made light of it and went off, one to his field, another to his business (hos men eis ton idion agron hos de epi tēn emporian autou). But in the Gospel of Thomas, Saying 65, the excuses are elaborated greatly:

> A man had guests, and when he had prepared the banquet, he sent his slaves to summon the guests. He came to the first; he said to him, My master summons you. He said, I have money for merchants; they will come to me at evening; I will go and give them orders; I excuse myself from the banquet. He came to another and said to him, My master has summoned you. He said to him, I have bought a house and am requested for a day; I will have no leisure. He came to another (and) said to him, My master summons you. He said to him, My friend will celebrate his wedding, and I will direct the banquet. I will not be able to come. I excuse myself from the banquet. He came to another (and) said to him, My master summons you. He said to him, I have bought a village; I go to get the rent; I will not be able to come; I excuse myself. The slave came (and) said to his master, Those whom you summoned to the banquet have excused themselves. The master said to the slave, Go out to the streets; bring those whom you will find, so that they may celebrate the banquet. The buyers and merchants (will) not (come) into the places of the Father. (Tr. by William R. Schoedel in Robert M. Grant, The Secret Sayings of Jesus, pp. 169-170).

Here are four excuses which are elaborated in a way to emphasize the final point about merchants. There is no need here to go into the question of the authenticity of the tradition behind Thomas, since we are concerned with the influences upon Luke. The comparison of these forms shows Luke to be closest to Deut. 20. 5ff. It also shows the "five yolk of oxen" to be peculiar to him. Apart from the midrashic explanation suggested in note 1 above, we may have evidence in this reference to oxen that Luke is not a physician but a veterinarian!

passage have meant to Luke in the context of the banquet midrash? Luke could have read the holy war theme as relating to the war with Satan which characterizes the post-resurrection period.[1] As some were unfit for battle, so some will be unfit for the kingdom of God. Luke does take the passage one step further: those making the excuses are responsible for them, and their decision is an eschatological one and thus irrevocable, as vs. 24 makes clear. Thus a seriousness pervades the parable which is not completely appropriate for a feast. The formula of excuse that is repeated by the first two guests: erōtō se, eche me parēitēmenon--"I beg of you have me excused" --sounds more like a request to be excused from a duty than it does like an apology for being unable to come to a feast. This may be a hint to us that Luke does have in mind here the battle theme of Deut. 20.5ff. The invited guests, then, are those who prove to be involved in the world and thus unable to recognize the seriousness of the times. They are probably not any one sociological group, although as we shall see below, Luke may see these invited guests primarily as Jews, but not exclusively so. The idea is very similar to the one Paul expresses in I Cor. 7.29-30: "...the appointed time has grown very short; let those who have wives (gunaikes) live as though they had none...and those who trade (agorazontes) as though they had nothing..."

The Meaning of the Parable of the Great Feast

The Destiny of Israel

#223. Four themes.--The conjunction of these Old Testament texts

---

[1] I accept in principle Conzelmann's analysis of the role of Satan in Luke-Acts; see the Theology of Luke, pp. 156-157, 181.

makes possible the development of four themes on the destiny of Israel which are implicit in the banquet parable and characteristic of Luke-Acts as a whole. (1) Some of Israel will be unfit for the last days (Deut. 20.5ff; implicit also in the "anger" theme of Is. 5 and the "place better than that of sons and daughters" in Is. 56). (2) Israel will not lose its place to others (Is. 65.22; implicit also in the "poor" and "blind" and "injured" imagery which expresses God's concern for his own people). (3) Israel will be joined by the Gentiles in the last days and they will have table fellowship together (Is. 25.6f.; 5.26; 61.6). (4) Israel will be served by Gentiles (61.5).[1] The first three points are explicit in the parable: the first in the excuses, the second in the first sending of the servant and the third in the second sending which brings Gentiles into the house along with the Jews for the banquet. But the parable has said in a compressed way what all of Luke-Acts says. The first theme is developed by the consistent assertion that some Jews do not accept Christ--the whole rejection theme which runs from beginning (Lk. 2.33--"the fall and rising of many in Israel") to end (Acts 28.28--"this salvation of God has been sent to the Gentiles; they will listen"). Yet the emphasis is always on some; never is Israel as a whole portrayed as being left outside. Moreover this theme is developed specifically in relation to worldly involvement, both in the Gospel (the Pharisees are "lovers of money" Lk. 16.14) and in Acts (Ananias and Sapphira). We can see here the dual significance of the term

---

[1]It is interesting to see some similarity between these four themes, all of which can be illustrated from Luke-Acts, and Paul's argument in Romans 11. 1) Part of Israel will be unfit for the last days; cf. Rom. 11.7, 9, 25. 2) Israel will not lose its place to others cf. 11.1, 23, 29. 3) Israel and the Gentiles will be joined together; cf. 11.24. 4) Israel will be served by the Gentiles; cf. 11.11, 31.

"poor" for Luke. While it has metaphorical meaning for him as a term for Israel, which God has forgiven and whom he calls into his kingdom, it also expresses an attitude toward money which cuts across Israel (more on the "poor" later in #243). The second theme is the other side of the first--Israel will not lose its place. To this is related Luke's principle of the Jew first which is repeatedly verbalized by the apostles and also acted out in the pattern of their activity which always begins with the Jews, whether in Jerusalem, or in the Diaspora. When Paul reaches Rome, he first calls together the Jewish community despite many previous rejections by the Jews. The third theme, that Israel will be joined by Gentiles in table fellowship is a dominant one for Luke. It is anticipated by Jesus' eating with sinners and tax-collectors; it is predicted by Jesus in Lk. 13. 29--the patriarchs and the Gentiles sit together at table. It is worked out in the Cornelius narrative, and in the Apostolic Decree (Acts 15. 20, 29). It is implicit in Acts 16. 34; 20. 7. The fourth theme is not developed in the parable itself but may be detected in the appointment of the Hellenist deacons to serve Hebrew widows in the daily distribution (Acts 6. 1-6) and the gift to the en tēi Ioudaiai adelphois sent in time of famine through Barnabas and Saul, whom Luke explicitly has identified with the Gentile churches (Acts 11. 27-30). This same theme is implicit in Luke 4. 25 where Elijah is fed by a Gentile widow, and in Acts 7. 11-14 where Jacob's family goes to Egypt for food. Thus the parable of the banquet, by means of this analysis of its Old Testament background, proves to contain many of the central themes of Luke-Acts. It also makes clear that the question of the destiny of Israel is rather complex in the Lukan writings and not easy to generalize.

#224. The "poor" and "blind" imagery.--A further word needs to be said concerning the second theme--Israel will not lose its place. I have suggested that the sending of the servant to bring in the "poor...etc." not only points in a general way to the Jewish mission but more specifically uses metaphors for the Jewish people which have particular significance for Luke. That these are metaphors and not simply literal groups of outcasts is indicated by the following considerations: (a) these terms are repeated in an explicitly eschatological context (see vss. 14 and 15, and compare vs. 21 with vs. 13) which suggests that they have a more metaphorical significance in this context. (b) Building on the observation that the two sendings of the servant refer to two phases of the mission of the Church, and accepting the Lukan principle of the Jew first, the first sending of the servant to bring in "the poor...etc." would naturally relate to the Jewish mission. (c) These terms ought not to be taken in a pejorative sense, however. We have seen that these are Isaianic metaphors for the people in exile (#58). More specifically, they are metaphors for the exiled Jews who have known God's wrath but are now the objects of his grace and redemption. It is just this significance which recommends them to Luke, for he understands the situation of Israel after the crucifixion and resurrection to be analagous to that of Israel in exile, and he takes pains at several points to show that forgiveness is extended to the Jews (Lk. 23.34; 24.47; Acts 2.38; 3.26; 5.31; 7.60 etc.). It should be noted that both the LXX and the Targum have interpreted these metaphors in the light of their own situation (#54-58). Thus Luke stands in a certain tradition. It may be regarded as felicitous from Luke's standpoint that these terms are able to express both his theology of

Israel and at the same time provide him with concrete descriptions of outcast peoples, making it possible for him to construct the parable in a realistic way and thus not destroy its quality as parable. Finally, it must be pointed out that Luke does not restrict this imagery to the Jews. There is evidence that at least in respect to the "blind," these terms can also be linked with the Gentiles. In Acts 26. 18 Paul relates to Agrippa his commission by Jesus Christ, who says to him "I have appeared to you... to appoint you... delivering (or choosing) you from the people and from the Gentiles to whom I send you to open their eyes that they may turn from darkness to light and from the power of Satan to God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins and a place among those who are sanctified by me." The themes of opening of the eyes, the power of Satan and forgiveness of sins are all present in Is. 61. 1-2 (see #213). In this context, while they refer to both Jews and Gentiles, the emphasis is probably upon Gentiles. Thus we are not dealing with a rigid system.

#225. The meaning of oikos in Luke 14. 23. --If our interpretation of this parable and its midrashic background is correct, there are good reasons to see in the term oikos a reference to the temple. Not only is this the common LXX word for temple[1] but in the Isaianic texts which underly the parable, the messianic banquet has its setting on God's "holy mountain" or his "house," both of which point to the temple (Is. 25. 6-10; 56. 7; 65. 25-66. 1). Furthermore in Luke, all those passages in which the word oikos clearly does refer to the temple are Old Testament allusions (6. 4; 19. 46; 11. 51; Acts 7. 57).

---

[1]See G. Schrenk, "to hieron," ThWbNT, III, p. 232.

This strongly suggests that with the discovery of an Old Testament background for Lk. 14. 23, the same meaning is to be seen in the term oikos there. Thus we turn now to a discussion of the meaning of the temple for Luke.

#226. The temple in Luke-Acts. --The temple is important for Luke but again, its precise meaning for him is not easy to summarize. In the opening of the Gospel it is the place of revelation of the Divine activity (1. 9; 2. 27, 37). The child Jesus, found in the temple by his parents, affirms that he must be in his Father's house (2. 49). Luke places the temptation at the temple last (4. 9); when Satan departs, Jesus is left at the temple and goes directly from there "in the power of the Spirit" to the synagogue at Nazareth. The cleansing of the temple is treated somewhat differently by Luke: Conzelmann has pointed out that Jesus does not really enter the city until the Lord' Supper; the emphasis in Luke is on the fact that Jesus goes to the temple directly upon coming to the city (19. 45) and remains there every day teaching.[1] In contrast to the other Synoptics, the discourse on last things, in which the destruction of the temple is predicted, is located there (21. 5ff). After the resurrection, the disciples are found frequently in the temple (Lk. 24. 54; Acts 2. 46; 3. 1ff., where a lame man is healed in the temple; 5. 20, 42). But after Stephen's speech, which is said before the Sanhedrin after Stephen is accused of speaking against the temple, the temple seems to be no longer "home" for the disciples. And although we learn in 22. 17 that Paul had a vision of Christ in the temple after his conversion, it is clear that Paul's visit to the temple in 21. 26ff leads only to strife. It seems clear as one surveys these passages that the earlier

---

[1]Conzelmann, Theology of Luke, p. 75ff.

positive role of the temple as a place of revelation gradually passes away, with the speech of Stephen serving as the apparent turning-point. We need to enquire more fully then into the meaning of this speech for Luke.

#227. Stephen's speech. --By virtue of its length and character this speech stands in a class by itself within Acts and most commentators regard it as a source reworked by Luke.[1] Some have sought to set its basic message over against the viewpoint of the author of Luke-Acts[2] but here we will try to see to what extent it can be understood in harmony with its setting, on the assumption that if, as most would say, it has been modified by Luke in some way, it probably does not present a view that grossly contradicts his own. In some ways Acts 7 is parallel with Luke 4. 16-30. In both cases a tendentious interpretation of the OT angers the hearers and incites them to murder. The parallelism may be extended by noting that in the case of Jesus, the rejection at Nazareth gives rise to a ministry away from his home town, and that Stephen's death gives rise to a mission outside of Jerusalem. Of course many have also pointed out the obvious parallels between the Stephen narrative--his reputed sayings against the temple, his being brought before the council,

---

[1]The most recent to put forth this opinion with supporting linguistic evidence is Max Wilcox, The Semitisms of Acts, pp. 159-161. Within the speech there are several Old Testament quotations which deviate from the LXX and are supported by a Semitic textual tradition (MT, Targums, Samaritan Pentateuch, etc.), two possible Semitisms and certain other features not characteristic of Luke but similar to constructions found in other speeches in Acts. Several opinions along the same line are collected by A. F. J. Klijn, "Stephen's Speech--Acts vii. 2-53," NTS, Vol. IV (Oct. 1957), p. 26, n. 1.

[2]Klijn, art. cit., p. 27 shows affinities between this speech and the thought of Qumran and asserts "the way in which Stephen interprets Jewish history is wholly different from what is to be found in the rest of Acts."

his death and words of forgiveness--and the Passion. All of this shows that certain structural lines draw this passage into relation with key Lukan texts. However, that does not mean that Luke says here only what he has also said somewhere else. An obvious contrast with the rest of the Lukan corpus is that there is much OT ground covered only here. Thus we must ask what its peculiar message is. Stephen's speech is making three interrelated points, two of which are fairly unambiguous, while the third requires more discussion: (1) God has made himself known frequently outside of Palestine (vss. 2, 9, 30-33, 36, 38); (2) the Jews have rejected those sent to them by God as their leaders and redeemers, or to put it more broadly, they have resisted the Holy Spirit (vs. 9-Jospeph; vs. 27-Moses; vs. 39-idolatry in the wilderness; vs. 51-summary statement); (3) God cannot be limited to the temple (vss. 47-50). It is this last point which requires discussion. The question is whether a contrast is intended between David, who desired a skēnōma for the God of Jacob, [1] and Solomon, who built an oikos to him. Most have taken it in this way, [2] with the supporting grammatical argument that the de of vs. 47 is meant adversatively. But it must be said that if such a contrast is intended, it is very sudden and subtle and by no means clear-cut. The first question we

---

[1]Accepting the reading tōi Theōi Iakōb in A. C. Koine, etc. thus conforming the text to Psalm 131. 5 (LXX). The difficulty with the admittedly better attested oikōi Iakōb (B, Aleph, etc.) is that it does not correspond to the OT in sense, it does not make much sense in context and raises problems for the meaning of autōi in vs. 47. It has been conjectured that oikoi is an error for the abbreviation of kuriōi --kō. This is unlikely, however. It is more likely, as Haenchen suggests, that an illegible theo was replaced by the very common phrase oikō Iakōb.

[2]Again A. F. J. Klijn, "Stephen's Speech," p. 26.

might ask is: what is the true OT background to this section? The common interpretation, that David did right to desire a "tent" for God but Solomon erred in building an oikos is very close to the view of Nathan in II Sam. 7, where David's desire to build a house for God is rejected by God who reminds David that He has always lived in a tent (II Sam. 7.6).[1] The real point of the Samuel passage appears to be that God will build a "house" for David--i.e. establish his dynasty. They are probably right who regard vs. 13, which mentions the building of a house for God's Name by Solomon, as a gloss.[2] But Acts 7.46-47 does not correspond exactly to II Sam. On the purely verbal level, we may note that skēnōma does not occur in II Sam. 7. But more important, it is clear that it is not a skēnē which David desires for God in II Sam. 7, but rather an oikos kedrinos--a house of cedar, like his own; it is precisely this desire for a house for God that is rebuked by Nathan. It is only Ps. 131.5 (LXX) that speaks of David's desire for a skēnōma for God: "I will not give sleep to my eyes nor slumber to my eyelids nor rest to my temples until I find a place for the Lord, a dwelling for the God of Jacob (skēnōma tōi theōi Iakōb)." It should be noticed, however, that Ps. 131 has a very "high" temple theology. The temple is called the place where God's feet stand (vs. 7--proskunēsomen eis ton topon hou estēsan hoi podes autou), his

---

[1]Cf. esp. M. Simon, "La prophetie de Nathan et le temple," Revue d'Histoire et Philosophie religieuse, Vol. XXXII (1952), pp. 41-58; idem, "St. Stephen and the Jerusalem Temple," Journal of Ecclesiastical History, II, (1951), pp. 127-42 (this article was not available to me).

[2]Cf. Yves Congar, The Mystery of the Temple (London: Burns and Oates, 1962), p. 26 (note 1 for further bibliography) and R.H. Clements, God and Temple (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965), p. 56 (note 2 for further bibliography).

"resting-place" (anapausin - N.B. that vs. 8 continues by saying that it is the restingplace of both God and his ark), and God is made to say quite explicitly of the temple in vs. 14--"This is my resting-place (katapausis) for ever; here I will dwell (katoikēsō) for I have desired it." If we take seriously therefore the fact that the author of Acts. 7.46 has gone to this Psalm for his description of David's attitude toward the temple (and with it, God's attitude toward it), we must face the fact that the Psalm is quoted in Acts with no hint of a negative attitude toward it. In fact it is said explicitly that David found favor before God. Moreover, it is clear from Psalm 131 that skēnōma is not a tent but the temple itself. This means that Acts 7.47--Solomon de oikodomēsen autō$_i$ oikon--can easily be taken as a complement to vs. 46. Solomon did only what David himself desired to do, with no intended contrast between skēnōma and oikos, these being simply two terms for the same reality--the Jerusalem temple. This close connection between David and Solomon is the view of I Chron. 17 where, in contrast to II Sam 7 (minus vs. 13) God clearly grants to Solomon the fulfillment of David's desire. That Luke's attitude toward Solomon is not entirely negative is rather clearly expressed in Lk. 11.31--"They came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon, and behold, one greater than Solomon is here." There is no suggestion that Solomon is a "bad guy" who has resisted the Holy Spirit. Rather there is appreciation of Solomon in his own time, but recognition that Solomon has been superseded. If this view of Solomon is also valid in Acts 7.47, it would suggest that the building of the temple is not a heinous act; it is rather a valid, but temporary one. It might be objected that immediately after the mention of Solomon's building of a house for God, the text of

Stephen's speech quotes Is. 66. 1, which seems to express the view of the author that "The Most High cannot dwell in things made by hand." This certainly suggests a critique of Solomon's work. Yet if we allow that the author knew Scripture at all well, he would surely know that Solomon himself was well aware of the idea expressed in Is. 66. 1. For in his prayer of dedication, he says "But will God indeed dwell (katoikēsei) on earth with men? If the heaven and the heaven of heaven are not sufficient to thee, even more this house (is not sufficient) which I have built for thy name"--III Kgs. 8. 27. The relation ofGod to the temple as one of transcendence is expressed repeatedly in Solomon's prayer first of all by the formula that it is God's Name that dwells there, and secondly by the repeated formula that God dwells in heaven (vss. 30, 39, etc. --tēs katoikēseōs sou en ouranō$_i$), where he hears prayers offered in the temple. Thus the use of Is. 66. 1 cannot be set sharply against Solomon, nor can it be taken as a total anti-temple polemic. It is more precisely a polemic against those who refuse to recognize that one "greater than Solomon is here," one who supersedes the temple and has the authority to predict its destruction (Lk. 21. 6). The polemic is not against the temple per se, but against those who cling to it and have murdered the One who has come to provide a new temple for all men. Thus clarified, the third point of Stephen's speech is this: while God at one time willed the building of the Jerusalem temple, he is not bound to it, but is free to supersede it. Thus stated, the third point is a variation of the first: God is not bound to the Holy Land as a place of revelation. It is more important to see how it is related to the second point. The building of the temple itself is not an act of idolatry nor of resistance to the Holy Spirit. But in their act of

stubbornly clinging to it and murdering the one who has come to supersede it, the hearers of Stephen make the temple into an idol and thus become like those in the wilderness who make the golden calf after rejecting Moses and "rejoice in the work of their hands."[1] Viewed in this way, Stephen's speech can be understood as primarily directed against a false view of the temple,

---

[1]The reader may call to mind the passage from Mekilta Exodus 20. 21 quoted above in #210 in the discussion of the interpretation of Is. 61. 1 in Jewish sources. Here I would like to point out some parallels between the structure and intention of Stephen's speech and that same passage in the Mekilta. In its discussion of Moses who alone was able to draw near to God, the Mekilta refers to Moses' meekness and the dwelling of the Shekinah with the meek. In this connection it quotes Is. 57. 15, 61. 1, 66. 2 (the last is quoted in Acts 7. 50) and Ps. 51. 19. Then it continues: "But whoever is proud of heart causes the land to be defiled and the Shekinah to withdraw, as it is said: "Whoso is haughty of eye and proud of heart (rehav levav), him will I not suffer" (Ps. 101. 5). Furthermore, one who is proud of heart is designated an abomination, as it is said: "Everyone that is proud of heart is an abomination of the Lord" (Prov. 16. 5). Idols are also designated an abomination, as it is said: "And thou shalt not bring an abomination into thy house" (Deut. 7. 26). Hence, just as idolatry defiles the land and causes the Shekinah to withdraw, so he who is proud of heart causes the earth to become defiled and the Shekinah to withdraw." (Lauterbach, Mekilta Exodus, II, p. 274). We may note a parallel between the "proud heart" of Mekilta and the "uncircumcized heart" of Acts 7. 51; the similarity between "causing the Shekinah to withdraw" and "resisting the Holy Spirit" and the fact that both texts link the proud (uncircumcized) heart with idolatry. When we add to this the reference to Is. 66. 2, we have an impressive similarity of thought. I would suggest that in Acts 7. 42, when the people become idolaters, and "God turned and gave them over to the worship of the host of heaven" this is parallel to or equivalent to the withdrawal of the Shekinah. Also behind the speech of Stephen is the conviction of its author that Jesus Christ has the Holy Spirit dwelling with him (Is. 61. 1 is a key text here) & that it is the proud heart of the Jewish leaders which rejects him (they resist the Holy Spirit; this is tantamount to idolatry and the temple becomes their idol) and this causes the Holy Spirit-Shekinah to be withdrawn again (see the thesis of Baltzer developed below). These similarities may prove that one does not need to turn to sectarian Judaism (e. g. Dead Sea Scrolls) to see the background for this speech, but that its viewpoint is understandable within the framework of rabbinic thought and exegesis. This perspective also reinforces our view that this speech is in basic harmony with the rest of the Gospel and Acts.

and yet be in harmony with the positive role which the temple can play in Luke as "the Father's house." We may now also understand why this speech is a turning-point in reference to the temple, for after Acts 7, it is no longer the center for the teaching and healing of the apostles. This is so not because the temple is in itself an idol. But it becomes an idol when Christ, whom, as we shall see, Luke regards as the doxa of God, is rejected in favor of it. It must be stressed, however, that the fate of the temple is distinct in Luke's mind from the larger question of the destiny of Israel. Stephen's speech is not directly related to the Jewish-Gentile question. This may be seen on purely structural grounds within Acts. In the first place, this speech and the martyrdom that follows does not lead directly to the Gentile mission, but rather to a continued Jewish mission outside Jerusalem, as Klijn has rightly pointed out. The rejection of Stephen is only one of many rejection scenes in Luke-Acts. Most important is the fact that this speech is followed by continued hearing of the Gospel by the Jews with success--13. 43; 17. 4; 28. 24. There are also further rejections of the Gospel by the Jews to be sure (13. 46; 17. 5; 28. 28), but this only makes even clearer that the episode of Stephen is not decisive in this regard. Thus the problem of the destiny of the Jews, of Israel, must be kept distinct from the question of the fate of the temple. There remain, then, two questions. (1) In what way is the view of the temple in Acts 7 related to Luke's overall view and particularly to the parable of the banquet? and (2) how typical of Luke's overall view of the destiny of Israel is the view put forward in Acts 7?

#228. The meaning of the temple for Luke. --Luke's total view may be generalized in this way: the temple at Jerusalem has a valid but transitory

place in the history of salvation. The idea of the temple as a dwelling-place of God among men has permanent validity for Luke, because Jesus Christ is the doxa of God. When Jesus is in the temple at Jerusalem, that building is truly the temple. But the presence of God is ultimately withdrawn from the Jerusalem temple and it is destroyed. Through the gift of the Holy Spirit, the early Church becomes the true temple, taking the place of the Jerusalem temple. Let us discuss each of the parts of this generalization in turn. (1) The assertion that the temple has a valid place for Luke is supported by the opening of Luke, by Jesus' daily preaching there during the last week, by the activity of the aposteles there in the early church and Paul's vision of Christ. Yet it is clear that this is a transitory validity. The destruction of the temple is predicted by Jesus and after Acts 7 the temple is the scene only of strife. Thus the temple building is used by God but is ultimately doomed. (2) The assertion that Luke regards Jesus as the doxa of God is put forward by Klaus Baltzer in a recent article.[1] Baltzer argues that Luke's view of the temple has been shaped by certain OT conceptions of the temple and its relation to salvation, especially Ezek. 8-11 and 43. Particularly important are (a) the tradition of the departure of the kabod from the temple (Ezek. 10. 18); (b) the connection of the kabod with the Mount of Olives (Ezek. 11. 23 and Targum Ezek. 11. 23 where the Mt. of Olives is explicitly named; also Zech. 14. 4); (c) the return of the kabod to the temple in the last days (Ezek. 43. 4-7) and (d) the cleansing of the temple abominations (Ezek. 43. 8-9). The departure

---

[1]Klaus Baltzer, "The Meaning of the Temple in the Lukan Writings," HTR, LVII (July, 1965), pp. 263-277.

and return of the kabod Baltzer links with the Ascension narrative in Acts 1, noting especially that the cloud (1. 9) is frequently associated with the kabod in the OT and that the Mt. of Olives is the scene of the Ascension. Luke has dealt with the traditions concerning Jesus' last week in Jerusalem in a way that focuses his activity entirely on the temple (following Conzelmann) so that he can be said to cleanse it in order to take possession of it for his teaching and preaching. The implication is that as in Ezek. 43, Jesus is the kabod of God who throws out the abominations and comes to his proper place. This is supported by the Lukan version of the Transfiguration which speaks twice (9. 31, 32) of the doxa of Jesus and also uses the "cloud" imagery. Finally, Baltzer suggests that Luke's arrangement of material in 13. 31-35 reflects this same Lukan identification of Jesus with the kabod//doxa. In the first place it is noted that in Jewish traditions, kabod, shekinah and ruaḥ haqqodesh become interchangeable to some extent.[1] Consequently it is possible to link Jesus as the doxa of God with his anointing by the Holy Spirit. As his use of Is. 61. 1 shows, Luke links Jesus as bearer of Spirit primarily with his healing activity (Lk. 4. 18; 7. 22). This is relevant to Lk. 13. 31-33 where a summary of his healing activity is given (vs. 32). In vs. 31 he is asked to leave ("Get away from here--Herod wants to kill you"); Jesus replys with a summary of healing similar to 7. 22, thus pointing to himself as bearer of Spirit (and thus also as the doxa of God).[2] Then there follows a prediction of the passion, ending with the statement "Behold your house (oikos) is forsaken." Baltzer suggests that oikos here is temple, and that Jesus' departure (Passion-

---

[1]Kittel, art. on doxa, TDNT, Vol. II, p. 246.

[2]See #116 for our discussion of Lk. 13. 31-33 and Is. 61. 1-2.

crucifixion) means the withdrawal of the doxa of God from the temple. One might continue this line of thought and point out that at the conclusion of his speech, Stephen sees the doxa of God with Jesus in heaven (7. 55), thus underlying the assertion that the temple cannot contain God (7. 48-50) and implying that Jesus is the doxa of God. (3) The assertion that the Holy Spirit is also related to the doxa of God rests mainly upon the Pentecost narrative and also upon the identification of ruah haqqodesh with shekinah//kabod. There is no question that Luke regards the Holy Spirit as present in the Church guiding it, and that its leaders are Spirit-filled persons. Yet it is not completely clear whether the return of the kabod as seen in Ezek. 43 is synonymous with Pentecost, or whether there is still a final return as promised in Acts 1. 11. In other words, this is the problem of the relation Luke sees between the doxa of God removed to heaven and the Holy Spirit present within the Church. One feels that they are related for him, that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Christ; yet just what the relation is, is not really clear. (4) Finally we can ask: What is the evidence that Luke regarded the community as the temple of God? The conception is quite fully developed in the NT in II Cor. 6. 14-7. 1; I Cor. 3. 16-17; Eph. 2. 18-22; I Tim. 3. 15; I Pet. 2. 3-6 and Heb. 12. 18-24. Gärtner has shown the similarity of these formulations to those of Qumran[1], where one finds a fully developed doctrine of the community as the temple of God. To what extent does Luke know of these conceptions which surely chronologically precede him in their

---

[1]Bertil Gärtner, The Temple and the Community in Qumran and in the New Testament; A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament (Cambridge: University Press, 1965).

development? The idea may be behind the use of Ps. 118. 22 in Acts 4. 11--houtos estin ho lithos ho exouthenētheis hyph' hymōn tōn oikodomōn ho genomenos eis kephalēn gōnias. The quotation comes from a temple context in the Psalm. And while it is true that its main point is in regard to the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ, [1] the phrase "head of the corner" may imply from the beginning a view of the community as the new temple with Christ in its midst. This possibility is supported by our interpretation of the banquet parable. If oikos in this parable is an allusion to the temple, that temple must be the "new" temple, the Church. This is necessary if one regards the sending of the servant out to fill up the house as an allusion to the mission of the Church. Thus it would appear that Luke regards the OT promises which speak of a messianic feast for Israel and the nations in God's temple as fulfilled in the table-fellowship of Jews and Gentiles in the early Church. [2] It may even be that he intends 13. 34--"Behold your house is deserted" and 14. 23--"Urge them to come in that my house might be full"to be an intentional contrast between the Jerusalem temple and the Church as temple. This contrast turns primarily on the question of the inclusion of the Gentiles in the temple-feast promises. In Acts 21. 28 Paul is accused of bringing Greeks into the temple and thus defiling it. The episode shows that the Jerusalem temple cannot be the place where the OT temple promises are fulfilled, for it does not allow Jew-Gentile fellowship. Thus its validity is

---

[1]Lindars, NT Apologetic, pp. 80-81, 170.

[2]It might be objected that the idea of Christ as the doxa of God is not at all explicit in the parable. Yet the role of the servant in the parable is roughly analagous to that of the Holy Spirit in Acts which directs the mission and carries it out through Spirit-filled men.

only temporary and in order to fulfill his promises, God must create a new temple. Yet it is interesting to see that Luke respects the integrity of the old temple. He takes pains to show that the accusation against Paul is false (21. 29 and 25. 8); Paul has not in fact defiled the temple. Although it is destined to pass away, the temple has its integrity within its own sphere (the same point is made by the fact that Luke does not criticize the fact that for thousands of Jewish-Christian (Acts 21. 20) the Jerusalem temple is still "home").

#229. Temple and the fate of Israel. --We may sum up the difference between the temple and Israel by saying that for Luke, the fate of Israel is bound up not with the Jerusalem temple but with Jesus Christ. The main difference is that with the temple, the Jews have only judgement and destruction to look forward to. With Christ, they have forgiveness. This we take to be the meaning of Stephen's word of forgiveness following his speech. The final question in this section is whether Stephen's speech develops a view of the destiny of Israel which is in harmony with our interpretation of the banquet parable and the rest of Luke-Acts. Klijn has attempted to show that Stephen's speech presupposes a doctrine of two kinds of men, good and evil, running through Jewish history, each determined by "spirits"--as we find this idea developed at Qumran. More precisely, Stephen speaks of "your fathers" and "our fathers." To make the division of these groups work out in the proper way, Klijn is forced to accept a poorly attested textual variant in 7. 38. Yet it is clear that in Stephen's survey, there are both faithful and unfaithful Israelites. It is almost a contrast between individuals like Abraham, Joseph, Moses, David on the one hand and the people on the other. But not quite, for

individuals like Aaron apparently fall on the bad side and the people in general are portrayed without any implicit judgement in vss. 11-16, 36, 44-45. After careful reading of this speech, I believe that the rigorous condemnation of vss. 51-53 is not a condemnation of Israel as a whole, but rather is directed to the leaders of Israel who are assembled before Stephen, who are identified both with those who crucified Christ and with those who in the past rejected Joseph and Moses. This is especially clear in a comparison of 7.35 with 2.36 where by parallel phrasing and vocabulary (e.g. arneomai) the rejection of Moses and of Jesus are linked. Thus I would see Acts 7 in harmony with Luke-Acts in general and with the banquet parable as we have interpreted it in #223 above--some Jews prove to be "out" and some to be "in." It might be said that the same is true for the Gentiles (13.10, 48; 14.5; 16.20ff; 17.32; 19.24ff). If Klijn is right, however, in seeing this speech as in harmony with the "two spirits--two groups of men" doctrine of Qumran, then it would be going beyond the apparent conception of Luke-Acts as a whole where there does not seem to be a rigid doctrine on the matter. Such a conception would be foreign e.g. to Acts 3.26, where Peter, addressing the Jews, says "God, having raised up his servant sent him to you first to bless you in turning every one of you (hekaston) from your wickedness." The hekaston would probably not be used by one who believed that the Jews were divided into two groups determined by good and evil spirits.

#230. Summary.--We have attempted to show that a midrash based upon Is. 61.1-6; 58.6-8; 25.2-9; 56.4-7; 65.21-66.2; Deut. 20.5-7 has provided Luke a basis for a theology of the last days, especially the question of Israel and the Gentiles coming together for the messianic banquet. This

theology is reflected in the Lukan form of the Parable of the Great Feast, but also may be seen throughout Luke-Acts. If we are correct in our analysis of Lk. 14. 16-24, it becomes clearer just how significant Is. 61. 1ff is for Luke. Not only is it somewhat programmatic in the sense that each phrase is illustrated in the Gospel; even more, the connotations which have been built into it by association with other OT texts have provided Luke with the biblical foundation for most of the themes of the Gospel and Acts: the rejection and acceptance of Jesus Christ; the destiny of Israel and the Gentiles; the fate of the temple; the contrast between rich and poor; Jesus' table fellowship with sinners and the Jew-Gentile table fellowship of the early church. The importance of the quotation of Is. 61. 1-2 by Jesus in the synagogue at Nazareth really seems to stretch not only through the Gospel but into Acts as well. With these insights we need now to return to the Nazareth pericope itself to see if the foregoing analysis helps us to resolve its exegetical difficulties. It is my belief that the link between the banquet midrash and the Nazareth pericope is in vss. 25-27--the Elijah-Elisha allusions. It is through a new interpretation of these verses that we may be able to come to a new interpretation of the pericope as a whole.

Elijah, Elisha and the Banquet Midrash

#231. Summary of the following argument. --Because the following section is particularly complex in its argument, a brief summary of it will be given. The point of contact between Luke's banquet midrash and the Nazareth pericope is the reference to Elijah in vs. 25. Luke intends this allusion to point to the fact that Elijah is fed during a time of famine by a Gentile: thus

the more elaborate description of the famine in vs. 25 (#107 above). The point of the Elisha reference is that a Gentile comes to Israel for healing. Thus the reference to Elijah and Elisha is a conjunction of the themes of eating and healing. There is indication that Luke has Elijah and Elisha in the background in Lk. 10. 7-9 where the activity of the disciples has the pattern of eating and healing. Supporting evidence that Luke has Elijah and Elisha in mind in 10. 7-9 is found in Lk. 22. 35ff: (a) this text refers back to 10. 7-9 and (b) Elijah is in the background (III Kgs. 19. 4-8--hikanon estin and the "strengthening angel"). Lk. 22. 35ff is important for another reason as well--the quotation of Is. 53. 12. Thus, as in Lk. 4. 18-19, 25-27, there is a midrashic link between an Isaianic passage and Elijah. A link involving the same passages: Is. 53. 12 and III Kgs. 19. 8, may lie behind Lk. 11. 22--the parable of the "strong man." Thus we see emerging a midrashic background to the Gospel linking Elijah and Isaiah with Jesus. Lk. 22. 35ff is particularly important for our total argument because of the quotation from Is. 53. 12. An extension of the context of this quote reveals that it contains themes which are characteristic of Luke's banquet midrash: particularly the themes of joy, the acceptance of all men, and the enlargement of the tent (= house = new temple). It is in this passage that we see how Luke has related the Cross to the banquet theme. The basic point of the passage is that all men are sinful and that Jesus is "counted with the sinful" on his way to the Cross. This interpretation involves the meaning of the word anomos in the Is. 53 quote. Here it is primarily the disciples who are revealed to be guilty by their possession of two swords before Jesus has commanded them to be bought. Thus the two swords passage continues the general theme of the last supper

discourses--the guilt and betrayal of the disciples. In this way Luke makes the disciples no different from all those who have rejected Christ for one reason or another. Jesus takes to the Cross the guilt of all men with no exceptions. Everyone around him is faithless; he is isolated in his obedience. It is this theme particularly which brings Elijah to mind, for Elijah too complains that he alone is faithful. But the "Elijah Christology" of Luke is supplemented by his "Isaiah Christology." Christ chooses to be counted with the sinful; in this way the Cross has meaning for them and after the resurrection, forgiveness may be extended to them. This is Luke's way of handling the problem of Jewish rejection of Christ in particular. While he sees forgiveness extended to all men, he wishes especially to announce the forgiveness of those who have been responsible for the crucifixion. Thus Lk. 22.35ff is related not only to Luke's Christology but also to his theology of Jewish-Gentile relations and the question of Israel's destiny. Here we see most clearly that Israel's destiny is bound up with Jesus Christ. It is noted that Paul, in Romans 11, has also linked Elijah with the question of Israel's destiny, although in a somewhat different way. Luke actually proves to have a fairly full "theology of Elijah" which is summarized in tabular form. This theology of Elijah in a general way corresponds to Jewish Elijah theology as we saw it in Chap. iv. Lk. 4.25-27 is part of this larger theology of Elijah. Through this re-interpretation of vss. 25-27, we are able to take a new perspective on the Nazareth pericope as a whole and suggest a different interpretation based primarily on the meaning of the Old Testament passages within it.

#232. The conjunction of eating and healing. --If we return now to the

questions raised in section #108 above we see a possible clue to the larger context out of which Luke has taken the references to Elijah and Elisha in Lk. 4. 25-27. It will be recalled that our analysis of these verses suggested a new possibility for their interpretation: Luke intends the reference to Elijah to bring to mind, among other things, the fact that Elijah is sent to a non-Israelite widow in order to be fed. In the time of famine in Israel, Elijah the prophet is sustained by a non-Israelite. [1] The widow's supply of meal and oil is miraculously increased so as to sustain Elijah and the entire household for many days. [2] But the visit of Elijah also brings about the death of the widow's son, causing the widow to say "What have you against me, O man of God? You have come to me to bring my sin to remembrance, and to cause the death of my son!" (III Kg. 17. 18). Then the boy is restored by Elijah. The conjunction of eating, forgiveness and healing is important for Luke: it summarizes the ministry of Jesus as the one who eats with sinners, forgives and heals. [3] Perhaps then the entire narrative of Elijah and the widow is in

---

[1]Compare the same theme in Acts 7. 11ff and 11. 28ff.

[2]There are parallels to this Elijah narrative in the Elisha stories in IV Kg. 4. 1-7 (a widow who appeals to Elisha is miraculously supplied with a great quantity of oil) and IV Kg. 4. 8-37 (a wealthy woman is hospitable to Elisha and feeds him regularly; her son, born in her old age, dies, and is revived by Elisha).

[3]This is clearest in Lk. 5. 17-6. 11 where the themes of eating with sinners, forgiving and healing are repeatedly developed. As we say elsewhere, just as forgiveness of sins and healing are signs of the kingdom, so is Jesus' eating with sinners and the outcast a sign of the kingdom, more specifically of the messianic banquet. Forgiveness and healing are to some extent interchangeable. This is quite explicit in Lk. 5. 29-32 where the sick and the sinful are paralleled. It is implicit in Is. 61. 1, where recovery of sight and aphesis to the bound suggests both healing and forgiveness. The word iaomai carries both meanings. We may note that the Targum plays on the same dual meaning (# 210above).

Luke's mind in Lk. 4.25-27, but especially the conjunction of eating and healing. The reference to Elisha's healing of Naaman serves the same function. For one thing, we have pointed out the similarity between a leper and a corpse, the cleansing of a leper and the raising of a dead person.[1] So Elisha's healing of Naaman is similar to Elijah's raising of the boy and was so regarded by the rabbis. The reference to Elijah and Elisha in Lk. 4.25-27 is then a reference to eating and to healing. More specifically it is an allusion to the prophet who is fed by an hospitable stranger and the prophet who heals (forgives). Is there any evidence outside Lk. 4.25-27 that Luke has reflected upon Elijah in this way?

#233. Lk. 10.7-9.--There may be a clue to Luke's peculiar understanding of Elijah in his account of the sending of the seventy.[2] In the Lukan version, the disciples are told to "remain in the same house, eating and drinking what they provide... do not go from house to house.. but when you go into a city and they welcome you (dechōntai hymas), eat what is set before you, heal the sick in it and say to them, 'The kingdom of God has come near to you'." We have here a peculiar Lukan emphasis upon eating and healing

---

[1]Sections #204 and 207.

[2]If, as is often suggested, the number seventy here has symbolic value as corresponding with the number of nations on earth (Gen. 10), we would have further evidence that Luke has associated Elijah and Elisha with the Gentile mission, as he has in Lk. 4.25-27. But if our following argument is correct, within this association, the themes of eating and healing are uppermost in his mind. Which is to say that the messianic banquet is one of the most important themes within the area of the Gentile mission. It is in connection with this theme in the OT that Luke sees the most fruitful anticipation of Jewish-Gentile relations. In other words, for Luke, the significance of the Gentile mission is not that the Gentiles are preferred to the Jews, but that because of it, the promises of God are fulfilled which bring Jews and Gentiles together into fellowship which is at its center in table fellowship. This suggests that for Luke Elijah is not merely an individual prophet, but a representative of the Jewish people.

which may be reflecting upon the Elijah narrative as a kind of model. It is interesting to note that in the Matthean parallel (18. 7-8) there is explicit reference to raising the dead and cleansing lepers, a conjunction which is also reminiscent of Elijah and Elisha and causes one to wonder if the tradition which informs both Evangelists may not have already been influenced by these Old Testament figures. The possibility that Elijah is in the background here is supported by a reference back to the sending of the seventy in Lk. 22. 35ff.

#234. Luke 22. 35ff. --The setting for this discourse is the Last Supper. Jesus has just promised the disciples that they will eat and drink with him at his table in the kingdom (22. 30). This is immediately followed by the peculiar Lukan saying "Simon, Simon, Satan demanded to have you that he might sift you like wheat, but I have prayed for you that your faith might not fail." Peter in reply reaffirms his faith. Then Jesus asks, "When I sent you out with no purse or bag or sandals, did you lack anything?" This is an allusion to Lk. 10. 4 where the same series--purse, bag, sandal--occurs (cf. Lk. 9. 3, the sending of the twelve, where the series is quite different). The disciples reply that they lacked nothing. This implies that they did in fact meet with hospitality and that at least some houses welcomed them and fed them. There follows the well-known command to buy swords: "He said to them, 'But now, let him who has a purse take it, and likewise a bag. And let him who has no sword sell his mantle and buy one. For I tell you that this scripture must be fulfilled in me, 'And he was reckoned with the transgressors'; for what is written about me has its fulfillment'. And they said 'Look Lord, here are two swords'. And he said to them, 'It is enough (hikanon estin).' " This is an important text for us because of the explicit theme of prophecy and

fulfillment, and the allusion to Is. 53. 12. But it is all the more important because Elijah seems also to lie behind this text, and one which follows very soon in verse 43 ("And there appeared to him an angel from heaven, strengthening him"). J. Jeremias has pointed out that in verses 38 and 43 there are similarities with III Kg. 19. 4-5, 7.[1] There Elijah has been threatened by Jezebel. He goes into the wilderness and sits down under a broom tree and prays "It is enough now, O Lord (hikanousthō nun); take away my life." He then sleeps, and twice an angel appears to him commanding him to "rise and eat" (vss. 5 and 7). Elijah eats and drinks and it is said that in the strength of that food (en tē_i ischui tēs brōseōs) he is able to go forty days and forty nights to Horeb (cf. Acts 1. 3?!). It is not difficult to understand how Luke could have seen in Elijah's prayer in the wilderness an Old Testament prefiguration of Christ in Gethsemene, and thus have added to his Gethsemene account the appearance of a strengthening angel. It is interesting for our study to note that III Kg. 19. 4-7 is another eating and drinking passage, and that Lk. 22. 35-38 has brought an allusion to Isaiah and to Elijah into the same context. The fact that Elijah is in Luke's mind in 22. 38 makes it more likely that he is also in his mind in 10. 7-9, since he has himself linked the two passages by alluding to the latter in 22. 35. And this supports our thesis that in Lk. 4. 25-27 Luke is reflecting on more of the Elijah narrative than just the raising of the widow's son but particularly the fact

---

[1]J. Jeremias, "Hēlias," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, II (1964), p. 935.

that Elijah is fed by a non-Israelite.[1] Before we go back to Lk. 4 we need to go deeper into the meaning of 22.35-38 for Luke, particularly the allusion to Is. 53.12.[2]

#235. Isaiah 53.12 in Luke 22.37.--This is not a clear passage, and Creed's comment is typical of commentators: "The connections between 36 and 37 and between 37 and 38 are not easy to catch, and the meaning of the whole is obscure....Here as elsewhere Luke has combined ancient and late

---

[1]Conzelmann has also linked Luke 4 with 22.35-38 but for a very different reason (pp. 36, 103 et al). He has linked the word sēmeron in 4.23 ("Today this scripture is fulfilled") with the shift in the aeons which he sees in the command to buy swords; that is, both show for Conzelmann that Luke sees the time of Jesus as a distinct time in the past. Here is an instance where I think Conzelmann's scheme has to some extent distorted these texts, and where a concentration upon the Old Testament background illuminates them.

[2]There is another allusion to Is. 53.12 in Lk. 11.22, and in this passage there may also be a link between Is. 53.12 and III Kg. 19.8. Lindars has pointed out that the phrase in 11.22--kai ta skula autou diadidōsin--is an allusion to ton ischyron meriei skyla because it is the goods of ho ischyros (vs. 21) that are divided by the ischyroteros autou, and in the Lukan context (esp. vs. 20--"the Kingdom of God has come upon you") it is clear that the meaning is that the stronger one is the Messiah who overcomes Satan. (Lindars, NT Apologetic, p. 85. Vss. 21 and 22 of the Lukan version of the parable are peculiar to him and it is these verses which contain the allusion to Is. 53.12). I would build upon Lindars' insight by calling attention to the fact that Is. 53.12 and III Kg. 19.8 are linked by the word ischyos (Elijah travels in the strength of the food given by the angel). It is apparently just this word that is in Luke's mind when he calls the angel which appears to Jesus in the garden a "strengthening angel" (aggelos...enischyōn auton). Thus Lk. 11.22 may be a bit of supporting evidence that Luke has linked Is. 53.12 and III Kg. 19.5-8. It is interesting to note that a similar link has been made in Jewish sources if we take note of the connection between Elijah and Phineas (#200 above): Phineas is interpreted in connection with Is. 53.12 in Sifre Numbers 25.13. The interpretation of the midrashic link in Sifre is quite different, however.

material without succeeding in effecting unity of idea."[1] The key to the interpretation of the passage lies in the Isaiah 53 quotation and particularly the word anomos. The same phrase from Is. 53.12 is found in Mk. 15.28 (Textus Receptus and a few other MSS) in connection with Jesus' position between the thieves, but this is not its meaning in Luke.[2] The term anomos occurs only twice in Luke-Acts: 22.37 and Acts 2.23. The latter reads: dia cheiros anomōn prospēxantes aneilate, which can be read either as saying that those who were responsible for Jesus' crucifixion were "wicked" or that the Jews murdered Jesus by having him crucified by Gentiles (NEB: "you used heathen men to crucify and kill him"). Both uses of anomos are well attested in other literature.[3] Conzelmann rightly points out that while the original meaning of the word anomos in Acts 2.23 may have been "through the hands of Gentiles," its meaning for Luke is more closely paralled by Lk. 24.7: hoti dei paradothēnai eis cheiras anthrōpōn hamartōlōn kai staurōthēsan.[4] It seems quite possible then that Luke can read the word

---

[1]Creed, St. Luke, p. 270. Many have despaired of understanding the text as it stands and have gone beyond Creed in dividing it up into more or less distinct fragments of earlier sources; e.g. NTS, IV (1958), pp. 225-6 where P. Winter reviews the work of Heinz Schürmann, and Emanuel Hirsch, Frühgeschichte des Evangeliums (Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1951).

[2]In I Clem. 16.1-13 Is. 53.1-12 is quoted in its entirety, but this particular phrase is not given special attention so that its significance for the author is unknown.

[3]It is used sometimes as a neutral term for Gentiles--those who do not know the law as in I Cor. 9.21. In other occurrances it definitely connotes wickedness; this is frequent in the LXX in parallel construction with asebēs, adikos, etc.

[4]Conzelmann, Theology of Luke, p. 92. He thinks that in 22.37, anomos means "criminal: apparently on analogy with Mk. 15.28. Although this passage is crucial for Conzelmann's whole theory of the "time of the Church"

anomōn in Is. 53. 12 as having the same meaning that hamartōlōn would have: "he was counted among the sinful." One must still ask, who are the sinful and what is their sin?[1] The sinful are the disciples, and their sin is quite

---

he discusses it only briefly on pages 82-85. He seems to regard the allusion to Is. 53. 12 as meaning that Jesus is a suffering Messiah, not a fighting Messiah; but the disciples misunderstand; they think they are called to fight, but actually they are called to suffer. The sword is symbolic for the fight against Satan whom they must battle because he has asked for them.

[1]Paul S. Minear, "A Note on Luke 22. 36," Novum Testamentum, VII (March 1964), pp. 128-134, replies by seeking to offer an alternative to the meaning which Conzelmann has attached to this verse, particularly the words alla nun, as signifying a shift in aeons, a shift from the time of Jesus (during which Satan has withdrawn) to the time of the Church (when the disciples must do battle with temptation and with Satan). Conzelmann's interpretation has an inadequate concern for the context. Minear is very appreciative of the way in which Luke has arranged "strategic conversations about the table," (although he does not indicate that he is at all aware of the midrashic background we have seen behind this Lukan interest in the present study). This is to be seen particularly in the Lukan Last Supper, where, says Minear, the emphasis has been placed by Luke on the after-supper sayings (to this location Luke has moved pericopes found elsewhere in Mark and one from Q). We find here four units of dialogue (Judas, the twelve, Peter, the twelve again). It is Minear's thesis that these four units are bound together by common elements. Most significant of these is the assertion that all four point ahead no farther than the Passion narrative. The prediction of betrayal is fulfilled in vs. 47, 48. Peter's denial is predicted and fulfillment appears before dawn (vs. 54f). The sifting of the disciples by Satan begins in the garden (vs. 40). Does the fourth unit in these after-supper sayings also point to the immediate future or, as Conzelmann asserts, to the "time of the Church?" Minear sees this unit in continuity with the rest and pointing ahead to the incident with swords in the Garden (vs. 49). The disciples action is closely linked with Judas' betrayal; moreover by their use of swords they are aligned with the arresting soldiers. Judas, disciples and soldiers all reveal that the power of darkness is having its hour (vs. 53) and it is to this that alla nun of vs. 36points. Another theme which binds these units together is that of Jesus' control of the situation. Minear says "Jesus remains in full control of the developing situation. His knowledge of the disciples and of God's design enables him not only to anticipate the impending events but also to halt those events when the divine purpose has been accomplished" (p. 131). Judas' betrayal is within the Divine plan (22. 22); the disputes over greatness do not annual the promise to sit on the twelve thrones; Satan's sifting of Peter is allowed but not to the point beyond which Peter can return. It is the same with the swords. This is shown by the hikanon estin of vs. 38 which may be linked with eate heōs toutou--"no more of this"--in vs. 51, when the swords are used. The first means that these

specifically their possession of swords before they are commanded to buy them, thus betraying their lack of trust (and their disobedience at least to the spirit of Lk. 10.3 where they are sent out "as lambs among wolves"). This places verses 35-38 firmly in the context of the discourses after supper which focus on the betrayal and deceit of the disciples. In this last scene before the crucifixion, the disciples are revealed to be among those sinful men into whose hands it is necessary that Christ be delivered. At the same time, they stand under the promise that they will eat and drink in the kingdom and sit upon the twelve thrones; they are being sifted by Satan--i.e. their guilt is being made manifest--but they will not be sifted to the point of no return because Jesus is to be numbered with them, and they will rise with him to forgiveness in the resurrection. Minear is evidently not acquainted with the link between this text and III Kg. 19.4-5, but with Minear's

---

two swords are enough to fulfill the prophecy; they are two witnesses to the fact that the disciples possessed swords before they are allowed to have them. The second indicates that their guilt is allowed to play itself out so far and no farther. The possession of swords as a sign of guilt is brought into bolder relief against the back-flash to the sending of the disciples in chapter 10, when they lacked nothing. Says Minear "The 'nothing' can be interpreted as ironic self-condemnation of their present disobedience." But the establishment of their guilt means that they are among those for whom Jesus dies. With the two-swords passage providing a climax and the reference to Is. 53.12 providing Luke's theological interpretation and the alla nun a summary note of emphasis, "Now it is clear that the apostles without exception are the anomoi with whom Jesus is to be "reckoned" in his arrest, trial and death. It is because of this very reckoning that the covenant promise in vs. 28, 29 becomes, in Luke's view, so powerful." I believe that Minear has managed to make sense of this difficult passage without resorting to redactions-geschichte and in a way that brings out important Lukan motifs. The element of control by Jesus which Minear sees here will become an important element in our interpretation of Lk. 4.16-30 and will be seen as a function of Luke's peculiar view of Scripture, #242.

interpretation of the passage it is easier to see why Luke would see the passages as parallel. Jezebel has promised Elijah that he will be dead by the next day. His withdrawal into the wilderness in the face of death is reminiscent of Jesus' withdrawal to Gethsemene. Verses 10-11 emphasize that Elijah feels deeply his isolation; he alone has been zealous for the Lord; he alone is a faithful prophet; all else have forsaken the covenant with God. As Elijah is the victim of a totally sinful age, so Jesus is delivered into the hands of sinful men. With this background, Jesus' final word--hikanon estin--is more of a sigh of despair. Minear suggests that the two swords are for Luke two witnesses to the guilt of the disciples and so are enough to establish their guilt. Perhaps that is too clever. Yet on analogy with the Elijah passage, we must see the main point of these verses to be that Jesus becomes totally isolated. It is a closing to the whole section which has brought forth the jealousy, betrayal and faithlessness of the disciples. Jesus now sees that the end is near, and he sighs, like Elijah, "It is enough... let me die." With this perspective on the text we can now look more closely at Is. 53. 12 itself. It will be helpful to reproduce something of the context:

> dia touto autos klēronomēsei pollous kai tōn ischurōn meriei skula, anth' hōn paredothē eis thanaton hē psyche autou, kai en tois anomois elogisthē· kai autos hamartias pollōn anenegke kai dia tas hamartias autōn paredothē. euphranthēti, steira hē ou tiktousa, hrēxon kai boēson, hē ouk ōdinousa, hoti polla ta tekna tēs erēmou mallon e tēs echousēs ton andra, eipe gar kyrios. platunon ton topon tēs skēnēs sou.....

The context of the line quoted in 22.37 reveals two things: 1) it shows that this line immediately continues with the idea of the servant "bearing the sins of many" and beyond that, continues with themes that are characteristic of the banquet midrash: joy (Is. 61. 2; 25. 6; 56. 7; 49. 13; 35. 5, 62. 5; Lk. 5. 33-

35); breaking-forth (hrēgnumi--Is. 58.6; Lk. 5.6, 37); the coming of children to the desolate one (Is. 49.19-21); the enlarging of the tent (Is. 49.21). Thus if we can see Luke paying attention to contexts, as we have consistently seen him doing, Is. 53.12 would be part of his Isaiah midrash, and the theme of Christ's being counted among the sinful at his death, and bearing their sin, would be closely linked by him to the themes which we saw being developed in the parable of the banquet and elsewhere. In 22.35, Jesus alludes to the time when the disciples were sent forth and they lacked nothing. Like Elijah, they were taken into the homes of strangers and fed, and while some may have rejected them, others welcomed them. This is the situation during Jesus' ministry until right before his death: some welcome him and some do not; e.g. at Nazareth he is rejected and immediately afterward received at Capernaum. These lines of acceptance and rejection are frequently drawn along lines of poor and rich, sinners and self-righteous. But these lines are not of permanent validity. E.g., Capernaum is the object of a woe-saying in 10.15. During the passion narrative, the lines become completely confused: all are guilty, even the disciples. This short period is a time of peirasmos, of testing. The command to buy swords is a test which, as Simeon prophesied (2.35) "reveals the thoughts out of many hearts." It reveals that the disciples already have two swords, and this comes as the climax of a banquet narrative in which it is made clear that the disciples are among those who misunderstood, betray and deny Jesus Christ. The disciples are made one with those who have rejected Jesus at Nazareth, the Pharisees who love money and reject the purpose of God for themselves (Lk. 7.30), and all those who in this sense are anomos. It is with these that Jesus is counted

in his death, it is the sins of these that he bears to the Cross. Thus with the crucifixion, these distinctions all flow into one category: all men are guilty. With the resurrection, these distinctions are wiped clean, for the resurrection means forgiveness, Lk. 24. 47; 2. 38; 3. 19; etc. With the resurrection comes a new era--the era of God's invitation and God's hospitality. The parable of the banquet speaks of the eschatological time after the resurrection and it is primarily to understand this time that Luke has searched the Scriptures. Is. 53. 12 (which speaks of the death of the servant who is counted with the sinful in order to carry their sins, and who in his death overcomes Satan and divides his spoil) flows into Is. 54. 1-2 (which speaks of joy and the bursting forth of light and the Spirit, and the enlarging of tent with children for the childless). Just so does Luke see the transition from the period of Jesus' ministry and death to the period after the resurrection as one in which men who have manifested their sin in their inhospitality (even those who seemed hospitable in the end are not) are now forgiven in the era of God's invitation to all men to join him in his banquet. It is along these lines that we are probably to explain the fact that in the Gospel, terms such as "poor," "rich," "sinful," "tax-collectors" are the key distinctions among men who are confronted with the Gospel and either accept it gladly or reject it; but these words occur not at all in the Acts--they have been wiped out by the crucifixion and resurrection and to continue to use them would pre-judge and obscure the post-resurrection situation. We will return to this theme later.

#236. Luke's Elijah theology. --We have dwelt at some length upon Lk. 22. 35-38 because it is an important text: it contains a key Isaianic quotation which Jesus relates to himself in a way similar to Lk. 4. 21. It also gives us

further aspects of Luke's theology of Elijah, showing that he has related this prophetic figure both to the figure of Jesus, and to the Jewish-Gentile question.[1] We can see developing a use of Elijah in a way that corresponds to Luke's schematization of history that Conzelmann has brought to our attention. Elijah is related to the time of Jesus, to the Passion and, we would assert, also to the time of the Church. Just how this is done may be clearer with the help of a chart:

---

[1]At several points we have noticed some similarity between Luke and Paul. Here again, there is a similarity with Rom. 11 and the way in which Paul uses Elijah there. Rom. 11.3 refers to the same passage we have seen in the background of Lk. 22.35ff--III Kgs. 19.10 and 14. Paul has asked if God has rejected his people. Elijah, the reader is reminded, pleads with God against Israel (kata tou Israēl) when he said "Lord they have killed thy prophets, they have overthrown thine altars, and I alone am left and they are seeking my life." Paul sees Elijah as the accusor of Israel, in a line with a Jewish tradition in which Elijah is the stern judge and fire-bringer (e.g. Sirach 48; cf. #206 above). But Elijah is introduced by Paul not to have the last word, but to introduce God's word--he has preserved a faithful remnant. In this way Paul develops his own theology of the destiny of Israel. Luke does not seem to be reflecting upon the remnant idea. He uses Elijah more as a model for the isolation of Christ, which is in turn related to his view of the guilt of all men. At the same time, Elijah is a model for the fellowship of Jews with Gentiles and the forgiveness which comes to Israel through the Gentiles. Both the Lukan texts we have studied and the Rom. 11.3 text show the extent to which early Christians combed the OT looking for clues to the meaning of their time.

	ELIJAH	=	CHRIST
PRE-RESURRECTION	Elijah is fed by the poor widow	=	Jesus is welcomed by tax-collectors and sinners and eats and drinks with them
	Elijah and Elisha are fed, and heal	=	Disciples sent out are fed, and heal
	Elijah raises son of non-Israelite widow Elisha heals non-Israelite leper	=	Jesus arouses anger of the people at Nazareth by implying that God is forsaking the "many widows and lepers" of Israel and turning to Gentiles
	Elijah's visit to the widow causes her son to die and brings her sin to remembrance	=	Jesus' visit to Nazareth turns the people's initially positive response to anger and makes their guilt manifest--which anticipates the crucifixion
CRUCIFIXION	Elijah about to die--goes into wilderness to pray	=	Jesus in Gethsemene
	Elijah the only faithful prophet left (Supplemented by Is. 53. 12--suffering servant)	=	Jesus left alone as all who seemed to trust him fall away and are shown to be faithless. Jesus counted with the sinful--i. e. he bears this guilt as he goes to the Cross
POST-RESURRECTION	Elijah raises widow's son	=	The resurrection brings the announcement of forgiveness to both Jew and Gentile (Lk. 24. 27)
	Elijah sustained by a Gentile; a Gentile healed by Elisha	=	The coming together of Jews and Gentiles in Christ means life and healing for both (parable of banquet, Lk. 14. 16-34)

If this seems too complex and schematic, let it be said that all these various dimensions of Luke's reflections on Elijah and Elisha can be documented from Luke-Acts and all we have done here is to try to see how they are related. Some of these elements we have discussed in some detail; others have yet to be fully elaborated. The point we are making is that Lk. 4.25-27 is part of a larger "theology of Elijah" in Luke which is given various expressions here and there in the Gospel and Acts. At any one point, certain emphases are uppermost, but one can detect nuances of the whole theology beneath the surface. This "theology of Elijah" has some points of contact with the development of Elijah in pre-Christian thought. Both roles of Elijah are part of Luke's conception: the role of judge and the role of reconciler.[1] Both these roles are implicit in the Nazareth pericope. As in the Jewish traditions we have analysed, Elijah and Isaiah have mutually influenced each other and certain Isaianic texts have been used by Luke to support or supplement the Elijah theology. Actually, it is the Isaiah theology that is dominant, and Elijah has been used to support and supplement it. This is what we see in Luke 4.16-30. It is Is. 61.1-2, and the implicit Isaiah midrash which is the background for its interpretation, that sets the main themes for the pericope and indeed for all of Luke-Acts as we shall see. Elijah and Elisha are used to support and supplement certain of these themes, but in a way that bears some similarity with the associations built up around Elijah in early Jewish sources, which leads one to believe that Luke is working within a Jewish exegetical tradition although he has certainly gone his own way at

---

[1]See section #206.

many points. We need now to make some of these ideas much more explicit by a detailed interpretation of the Nazareth pericope.

The Meaning of Luke 4. 16-30

#237. The relation of Luke to Mark. --The key to the interpretation of this pericope lies, it seems to me, in the fact that not only does Luke presuppose the Markan narrative in Mk. 6. 1-6, but his version of the Nazareth visit is actually a commentary upon the Markan narrative which deepens and to some extent corrects its meaning. I would see Luke reading Mark in a way that is analagous to the way he reads the Old Testament--he is looking for every possible clue to an understanding of his own time and especially the Jewish-Gentile situation. He sees in Mk. 6. 1-6 a key text coming out of the tradition dealing with the problem of the Jewish rejection of Christ. His own version of the incident could be termed a theologization of the Markan account. The most important element in this theologization is that of prophecy and fulfillment. It is this dimension which creates the most significant contrast between the Markan and the Lukan account: in Mark, Jesus is somewhat at the mercy of the people and he is amazed at their response to him; in Luke Christ is in complete control of the event. He chooses and reads the scriptural underpinnings of the event, announces the fulfillment of this divine plan, and then proceeds by his own words to bring this plan into actual fulfillment to the point that he is forcibly rejected and an attempt made on his life; then he disappears. It is this element of control that gives unity to the pericope; it particularly helps to clarify just those verses in the middle of the pericope which have been the despair of so many interpreters: vss. 23-27.

I think that we can distinguish three stages in the Markan narrative which Luke has quite consciously transformed. We will briefly indicate these here and then develop them in more detail. (1) Mark--the people have heard of Jesus' mighty works but have not experienced them directly; Luke--this is transformed into a demand for signs based upon hearing projected upon the people by Jesus. (2) Mark--Jesus is unable to heal and "explains" this failure with a proverb about the prophet who is ironically honored everywhere but his own village; Luke--this is transformed into a theological principle, marked by the term amēn, which expresses the necessity that Jesus be rejected according to the plan of God. (3) Mark--Jesus is able to heal a few; Luke--this is transformed into an implicit promise of forgiveness to the people who will reject Jesus, a theme which the reference to Elijah and Elisha carries out.

#238. The first stage: the demand for signs. --In Mark, as we have mentioned already in section #84, there is an implicit reference to Jesus' healing activity in Capernaum in the phrase kai hai dynameis toiautai dia tōn cheirōn autou ginomenai because up to that point in the Markan narrative Jesus has not actually healed anyone at Nazareth but only in Capernaum. Thus Luke's word which he has Jesus put into the mouth of the people--"what we have heard you did in Capernaum do here also in your own country"--has simply made explicit what is already implicit in Mark. [1] The words of the

---

[1]Thus Conzelmann rightly rejects an attempt to explain this feature of Luke by reference to a Proto-Luke (Theology of Luke, pp. 32-35), but overstresses the importance of the mention of Capernaum when he tries to make this the key to the interpretation of the entire pericope.

people themselves are made to refer to a past event. As many have pointed out, this creates a problem in Luke because in his chronology; the healings at Capernaum follow the visit to Nazareth. I regard Luke's handling of this to be a quite deliberate effort to deal with the chronological problem. He has changed the chronology of the event for structural and theological reasons: he sees the Nazareth event as implicitly containing all the important themes which he has woven into the Gospel and Acts and so it rightly belongs at the beginning of Jesus' ministry. So Luke is under the literary constraint to refer to events that have not yet taken place within his own Gospel. But he is under another constraint as well. That is his deliberate decision to put Jesus in control of the dialogue; to have Jesus put words into the mouths of the people. This decision helps him to solve the chronological problem. It is chronologically impossible for him to have a direct quotation of the people's words: "what we have heard you did in Capernaum do here also in your own country." It would also by stylistically impossible for him to somehow couch a direct quotation so as to make it refer to future events; the people cannot plausibly say "We know you are going to do some mighty works at Capernaum after you leave here so why don't you do them here?" The only solution for Luke is to make the words of the people an indirect quotation of words that they will say once they have heard of Jesus' activity at Capernaum. There is nothing intrinisically implausible about this. Jesus frequently "reads the thoughts" of his hearers in a way that can be understood in a purely human way as good insight into human nature. In this case Jesus could be understood as articulating what he knows very well they <u>will</u> say once they hear what he has done at Capernaum. But there is more to it than that. While the

dialogue is psychologically plausible, Luke has deliberately made it theological. He decides to have Jesus in control of the dialogue because for Luke he is Jesus Christ, the Lord of history, who comes to Nazareth knowing his fate and interpreting the Scriptures concerning himself in a way that cannot be understood until after the Resurrection when he interprets them to the disciples. And so Jesus tells the people what they will say to him. In having the people demand signs in their own village, Luke has again transformed the Markan narrative. For Luke, the demand for signs is a form of misunderstanding and unbelief. Here we may accept many of Conzelmann's insights about Luke's view of signs: they are given by Jesus to those whom he calls to be his witnesses. But I am not sure that this can be pressed so far as to say that this pericope reflects the conflict between Paul and James the brother of Jesus on the question of who belongs to Jesus Christ. For one thing, it is not at all clear in Luke that Jesus' family are present at the Nazareth synagogue, whereas this is quite explicit in Mark. I think the emphasis on the family ties has been dropped by Luke in order to make this event more typical in its meaning: the people of Nazareth stand for Israel. Jesus will go on to be received at other places but in the end everyone will be on the side of the people of Nazareth, even those like Peter who claim most vociferously to be loyal to Jesus. That is one thing that makes the Nazareth event important for Luke: it anticipates what will become very clear at the crucifixion. Before all the success stories which Luke has received in the tradition he places this failure which is a prolepsis of what will be the true situation. The demand for signs is one important element of the misunderstanding that ultimately leads to the Cross. This demand for signs

introduces the hint of unbelief in the words of the people: "Is not this the son of Joseph?" Brun is right in his observation that this phrase "son of Joseph" is associated by Luke with Jewish unbelief. Here he again is deliberately changing the Markan account in order to make the scene more precise. Had the people said "son of Mary" there might be some room to think that they really perceive who Jesus is and from whence he comes. For Luke "son of Joseph" provides a transition from seeming acceptance to final rejection. It is a clue dropped by the people that their gracious response to Jesus needs to be tested and, if we may be so bold, demolished. On this shift from an initial gracious response to the final rage, we will have more to say a bit later. Right now we need to explore further the significance which Luke attaches to the demand for signs. He has made the Markan account more explicit at this point; he has transformed the Markan account according to his understanding of the kind of unbelief that ultimately sends Jesus to the cross; but he has also brought a new element into this part of the scene--the saying "Physician, heal yourself." It is with this proverb that the demand for signs is introduced. What is its significance? I see it as carrying much of the irony of this narrative.[1] In the first place, it is a proleptic remark because it looks forward to the crucifixion and particularly to 23. 35 and 39 when the people mock Jesus and say "save yourself and us" (sōson seauton kai hēmas). The irony of 4. 23 and 23. 39 is the same; in both instances the people ask for healing or salvation after it has already been given them in the form of forgiveness. In Luke 4, the people ask for healing after the announcement of

---

[1]Brun has also called attention to the note of irony. See #85 note, above.

the acceptable year of God; in Luke 23 they ask for salvation after Jesus has spoken the words of forgiveness from the cross (23. 34). This parallelism between 4. 23 and 23. 39 encourages me to make an even bolder interpretation. Because of the close association between healing and forgiveness in Luke's mind (expressed for him in the dual meaning of aphesis in 4. 18-19; cf. #213), we may suggest that in the words of the people: iatre therapeuson seauton, Luke sees a request for forgiveness. The word seauton, means in this context not Jesus but his people. This is clear from what immediately follows. Jesus is asked not to heal himself, but to do among his own people what he has done in Capernaum. The demand is "physician, heal your own people." I am suggesting that Luke sees in these words an unintentional request: "physician, forgive your own people."[1] This is not at all obvious to be sure, but when this passage is viewed within the totality of Luke-Acts, such a possibility seems to be suggested.[2]

---

[1]This suggestion would admittedly be stronger were the verb used here iaomai, which frequently is used with the meaning "forgive" whereas therapeuō seems never to have this meaning.

[2]Some suggestions along this line have already been made in #229. Luke has emphasized the forgiveness of the Jews at Lk. 23. 34 ("Father, forgive them"); 24. 47 ("forgiveness should be preached. . . beginning from Jerusalem"); Acts 2. 38 (Peter's sermon at Pentecost); 3. 26, 5. 31; 7. 60; 26. 17. The possibility I am suggesting is that Is. 61. 1-2, with its message of forgiveness and opening of the eyes of the blind, is directed by Luke not exclusively but especially to the Jews, and that he intends it to have permanent validity up into his own time. In other words, this offer of forgiveness is not set aside e. g. by the closing of Acts. In reference to Acts 28. 17-31 there are several questions which may be raised: (1) what is Luke's intention in this final scene? (2) how are we to understand the statement--hoi men epeithonto tois legomenois--vs. 24? (3) is the quotation from Is. 6. 9-10 meant to be a final and solemn word against the Jews which puts them decisively into the past as having had and lost their chance to hear and receive the gospel? (4) does Luke intend us to understand both Jews and Gentiles coming to Paul during the two-year period when he apedecheto pantas tous eisporeuomenous pros auton, or

only Gentiles? (5) is the blindness of Israel a permanent blindness in Luke's mind? or only temporary? Haenchen has interpreted this passage consistently in a way that emphasizes the unbelief of the Jews and Paul's rejection of them. The epeithonto of vs. 24 signifies only a superficial interest in Paul's words; he compares this scene with 23.9--Paul before the sanhedrin (but surely this is not an apt comparison). The quotation from Isaiah is meant to speak only of hardening of the heart and does not at all envisage the possibility of hearing (Haenchen argues that mēpote cannot mean here "unless" as it means in the contxt of Jesus' words). The final statement is meant to refer only to Gentiles coming to Paul (Apostelgeschichte, pp. 656-659). It is certain that the closing of Acts presents us with a kind of summation of previous asservations concerning the Jews and the Gentiles (e.g. 13.46f). What has been said in other cities is now said in Rome in a very solemn way. The question is whether Luke intends this to be the last word theologically. Is this encounter with the Jews in Rome the last straw which calls forth the permanent validity of the Is. 6 passage? I question this interpretation. It seems to me that throughout the book of Acts, Luke take pains to show that the reception and rejection of the Gospel does not follow strictly the lines of Jews and Gentiles. There is success and failure on both sides. So here at Rome, the Jewish community is divided. If Luke had wished to make the point Haenchen claims, he would not have needed to include the statement that some were persuaded by Paul. With the Jewish community going out from Paul disputing within itself, it is only natural to assume that some of these Jews would return, and that Jews are included among those who come to Paul during his final years at Rome. Indeed, certain Mss. add the phrase "Jews and Greeks" in the final verse; though this phrase has little chance of being an original reading, it expresses the true intention of Luke. As for the quotation from Is. 6.9-10, I would call attention to the fact that immediately after the portion quoted, the prophet raises the question of the duration of the blindness of the people--kai eipa heōs pote kyrie; kai eipen, heōs an eremōthōsi poleis. I am tempted to link this with Lk. 21, which speaks of the destruction of Jerusalem--"until the times of the Gentiles are completed." It may be that Luke sees the period of Gentile superiority as a limited period, in a way similar to Paul. Finally I would point to the parallelism between Luke 24 and Acts 28, indicated by Paul Schubert: Schubert, ZNW Beihefte 21 (1954), p. 185: "The concluding double scene of Acts (28.17-31), Paul's two meetings in Rome with the local leaders of the Jewish community and with a "fairly large audience" (pleiones), is a deliberate and close parallel, structurally, formally and materially (proof-from-prophecy scheme) to Luke 24.1-53." In Luke 24, the doubt and fear of the disciples is turned to faith and joy by the opening of Scripture. Does this not suggest that we are to see in Paul's two-year activity a similar result?

#239. The second stage: "no prophet is acceptable."--The difference between Mark and Luke at this point well illustrates what I mean by saying that in Luke Jesus "controls" the situation. In Mark, it is said that the people take offense at Jesus, and Jesus replies with the saying about the prophet who is honored everywhere but his own village. In Luke the order is reversed, and the meaning changed. The statement about the prophet comes first, after which the people forcibly reject Jesus. Furthermore, the prophet saying in Luke arises out of Scripture; it is grounded in the necessity of the divine plan. Jesus announces it, and the people fulfill it in their actions. The Markan form of the saying puts it into the class of "human wisdom." It is an ironic commentary upon human nature. Mark does not attach great significance to the saying; his Gospel does not go on to bring out deeper dimensions of its meaning. But in Luke the saying has particular importance. This is marked first of all by the word amēn, which, as we mentioned earlier is an unusual word in Luke's Gospel. I agree with J.C. O'Neill that the term is used deliberately by Luke to call attention to sayings of importance; sayings whose significance, as O'Neill puts it, "apply directly to the life of Christians who read them."[1] O'Neill goes on to interpret the meaning of this saying in a way which from my point of view is mistaken, but nevertheless the stylistic principle holds. The saying has the same meaning as the phrase dei ton huion tou anthrōpou polla pathein (Lk. 9.21), and just as the term dei implicitly refers to Luke's understanding of prophecy and fulfillment, so the

---

[1]J.C. O'Neill, "The Six Amen Sayings in Luke," Journal of Theological Studies, n.s. X (April, 1959), pp. 1-9.

saying "a prophet is not dektos in his own country" is immediately followed by a scriptural reference. Jesus comes before the people of Nazareth as one who knows his fate already and he announces it to them before it is actually carried out. Here there is some similarity with the sending of the prophet Isaish in Leviticus Rabbah (section #211 above)--the prophet is sent knowing that he will be rejected by his own people. Again, however, there is another level of meaning. The term dektos is found also in the quotation from Is.61. 2- keryxai eniauton kyriou dekton. There is an intentional contrast between Jesus' proclamation of the acceptable year of the Lord, and the statement that a prophet is not acceptable in his own country. The term dektos relates the Nazareth pericope to the theme of the hospitality of men and the hospitality of God. The phrase eniauton ktl... permits two interpretations--the year in w hich the Lord is accepted, and the year in which he accepts. We have already seen the way in which this dual theme is played upon by Luke in various parts of the Gospel. Within the Nazareth pericope, the link between the acceptable year and the unacceptable prophet anticipates the theme that is developed throughout the Gospel and climaxed in the "two swords" passage: the hospitality of men must be tested and judged and shown for what it really is: disobedience and faithlessness. One can say, therefore, that the initially gracious response of the people to Jesus must be changed into rejection before the hospitality of God can actually be extended. Their positive response to Jesus is "pre-crucifixion/resurrection naivte" which Jesus must reveal to be rejection in order to include his own people in the forgiveness of God. Jesus then, as the one who knows his fate, and knows the plan of God, controls this scene so as to cause the people to reject him. This he does first by

the saying "A prophet is not acceptable in his own country." He reinforces this by reference to Elijah and Elisha. This carries us to the third stage.

#240. The third stage: tendentious healings. --We have already seen that the Elijah-Elisha stories are used by Luke in several ways and their introduction here is only a part of a larger "theology" of Elijah which constitutes a secondary theme throughout Luke-Acts. We need now to make as precise as possible the most immediate function which these verses play in the Nazareth pericope. That function is that they are used by Jesus to deliberately anger the people. Elijah and Elisha are used as a climax to a series of deliberately enraging announcements by Jesus. Jesus has first of all attributed to the people mockery ("Physician, heal yourself"); then a false demand for signs ("do here what you did in Capernaum"); then he announces that he cannot be welcome in his own country. Now he says, in effect, that God deliberately turns his back on his own people. The point of these verses, with their contrast between the many widows and lepers in Israel, and the one non-Israelite widow and the one non-Israelite leper, is that God is free to forsake his people; to ignore them. Elijah is sent (understand--by God) to to the widow. Naaman is sent to Elisha for healing. Viewed in this way, these verses are not at all out of harmony with the rest of the pericope. They are the "last straw" which cause the people to rise up in rage. There is no other response that they can make. The movement of the narrative from the time that Jesus picks up the speaking and controls it is toward this anger. From this perspective the pericope as a whole has unity. It is necessary that the positive response of the people be changed into rejection, just as in the Gospel as a whole, it is necessary that the acceptance of Jesus by the disciples

be changed in the end to betrayal and denial and disobedience. Commentators have not seen clearly enough that verses 25-27 are a highly tendentious reading of the Old Testament and that they are, one might say, uncalled for. It can be said that Jesus rejects his own people before they reject him and their rejection of him is the only response they can make to this insistent judgement upon them. This interpretation would be inconceivable if there were not another level of meaning, however. If this was all the narrative meant, we would have to brand Luke as the most brutal anti-Jew of the evangelists. We have tried to show that at several points, Luke is covertly anticipating the theme of forgiveness. It is, of course, openly expressed at the beginning of the narrative, in the quotation from Is. 61.1-2. We are merely maintaining that the forgiveness extended at the beginning has already anticipated the rejection that will take place, and it is meant to be extended to the blindness and bondage of that rejection. It may be put even more strongly: Jesus makes the people become poor, bound, blind, oppressed, just so they too can be among those who are fogiven. It is once again tempting to see Luke working out in a narrative form a theology very similar to Paul's in Romans 9-11, [1] especially 11.32: "God has consigned all men to disobedience that he may have mercy upon all." That may seem to be the importation of Pauline theology into Luke, but it seems to me that this narrative must be understood in this way in order for it to make sense as a whole and within the total framework of the Gospel and Acts. Thus while the reference to Elijah and Elisha is the climax to a judgement upon the people

---

[1]See #223, note, and #232 above.

which causes them to rise up in rage and throw Jesus out of the city, the same reference contains themes which anticipate the forgiveness of the people. The same dual theme is in the Elijah narrative itself: his visit is initially a judgement upon the widow which dauses the death of her son and brings her sin to remembrance. The raisi ng of her son is an act of forgiveness. The parallelism is not perfect, however, for the people of Nazareth cannot be identified with the widow directly. Luke sees a thematic parallelism: Elijah's visit means first judgement, then forgiveness; Jesus' visit means first judgement, then forgiveness. The same theme can be seen in another way if the attention is focused upon the fact that the widow and Naaman are Gentiles. The sending of Elijah to the widow and Naaman to Elisha is an implicit judgement upon Israel. But if Israel can identify itself with Elijah, [1] the faithful prophet (= Jesus Christ) then it can see that Israel is sent to the house of a Gentile to be fed. God does not in fact forsake his people; he has chosen to feed them with and through the Gentiles. In other words, I see in Lk. 4.25 an implicit link with the banquet midrash as it has been developed above. For Luke, the reference to Elijah and Elisha looks forward to the time when the coming together of Jew and Gentile means sustenance and healing for both. Perhaps that is why there is a movement in two directions: Elijah goes to the Gentile; the Gentile Naaman goes to Elisha. Elijah is fed by a Gentile; a Gentile is healed by Elisha. What looks like a

---

[1] In #223 above, we have developed one of the themes implicit in Luke's Isaiah midrash: Israel will be served by the Gentiles. We are now suggesting that this theme is also implicit here in Lk. 4.25ff, and that as the Sarapta widow has become a symbol for the Gentile world, so Elijah has become a symbol for the Jews. The parallels between Elijah and Jesus created by Luke help to support this development.

tendentious anti-Jewish reading of the Old Testament proves, as the Gospel and Acts unfold, to be a gracious reading of the OT in which the peaceful living together of Jews and Gentiles is prefigured. Luke has seen a hint of this in the Markan comment that despite the offense taken by the people, despite the fact that Jesus could do no mighty work there, he did lay his hands on a few sick people and heal them. This healing of the few corresponds to the healings by Elijah and Elisha which point to the final healing of both Jews and Gentiles.

#241. Luke's Christology in the Nazareth pericope. --Both the prophet Isaiah and the prophet Elijah are models for Luke's Christology in the Nazareth pericope, and the text from Is. 61.1-2 contains all the themes, some explicit, some implicit. In chapter iv we called attention to the portrait of the prophet Isaiah in Sirach 48 as the one who sees the last things and as the prophet of comfort. A line of exegesis which has its roots in the pre-Christian period develops this portrait of Isaiah along the lines of Spirit-anointing and his sufferings at the hands of his own people. All of these themes are found in Luke 4.16-30. Is. 61.1-2 explicitly identified Jesus as the Spirit anointed prophet. As the pericope unfolds it is made clear that to be anointed by the Spirit means to be rejected by one's people. But Jesus also comes to Nazareth as the one who will, after the resurrection, make the scriptures concerning himself clear to the disciples. He stands up in the synagogue not only to read from Isaiah a prophecy concerning himself, but to bring that prophecy into fulfillment that day in Nazareth. Like Isaiah, Jesus sees the last things: he sees not only the Cross but also resurrection and forgiveness. He brings about the judgement upon the people that will cause

them to reject him; by so doing, they make him the outcast one who is numbered with the sinful so that he might bring them with him to forgiveness, to the final banquet to which all are invited. The model of Elijah supports and elaborates these themes. In Sirach 48, Elijah's earthly role is primarily that of judge; his eschatological role that of peace-maker and reconciler. This is roughly analagous to the role of Jesus: at Nazareth he brings judgement; after the resurrection he brings forgiveness. The Isaiah theology, especially the suffering servant theme, supplements that Elijah model and provides the transition from judgement to forgiveness: Jesus is counted with the poor, the outcast, the sinful; he bears their sin to the cross. We have seen some traces of a similar theme in Jewish exegesis: the one who brings good news to the poor is himself poor, or humble.[1] Luke has greatly elaborated this theme and made it an important dimension of his Christology. These parallels between Luke's Christology and certain features of Isaiah and Elijah indicate that Luke probably stood in an exegetical tradition, the rough outlines of which we can trace. The fact that at several points the same biblical texts are used to develop these themes supports the contention that Luke is not creating something out of nothing. Nevertheless, he has also gone his own way at many points.

#242. Luke's dual view of Scripture. --In our interpretation of the Nazareth pericope we have developed the somewhat unusual idea that the Scriptures referred to in this incident by Jesus cause the people to become angry; they are understood by the people to be a reading of the Old Testament

---

[1]See sections #210-211 above.

against them, and so they try to kill Jesus. But as the Gospel and Acts unfold, this understanding proves to be a misunderstanding, for in fact, these very texts are at the heart of Luke's theology of forgiveness. There seems to be a rather unique view of Scripture being worked out here, a view which I believe Luke has given fairly explicit expression in Lk. 24. 25-27 and 44-48; as well as Acts 3. 17 and 13. 27-28. In the last mentioned passage, Paul is addressing the Jews in Antioch of Pisidia. He says "For those who live in Jerusalem and their rulers, because they did not recognize him nor understand the utterances of the prophets which are read every sabbath, fulfilled these by condemning him" (hoi gar katoikountes en Ierousalēm kai hoi archontes autōn touton agnoēsantes kai tas phōnas tōn prophētōn tas kata pan sabbaton anaginōskomenas krinantes eplērōsan). This clearly states that the Jews fulfilled Scriptures they did not understand; it implies that it was the ignorance of the true meaning of Scripture that led to the rejection and crucifixion of Jesus. A similar idea is expressed by Peter in Jerusalem: "And now brethren I know that you acted in ignorance, as did also your rulers. But what God foretold by the mouth of all the prophets, that his Christ should suffer, he thus fulfilled." Here the theme of ignorance is again joined with the theme of fulfillment of Scripture. It is not said that had the people understood Scripture, things would have gone differently. But it does show that Luke has a clear idea that Scriptures were not understood before the resurrection, yet they were fulfilled. When these two texts are put with Lk. 24, it becomes even clearer that it is the risen Christ himself who makes known to the disciples the true meaning of Scripture. As Paul Schubert has pointed out, this chapter reaches it climax in the working out of the proof

from prophecy theme;[1] at two points, the fear and unbelief of the disciples is turned into faith by the exposition of Scripture by the risen Christ: "O foolish men, and slow of hear to believe all that the prophets have spoken! Was it not necessary that the Christ should suffer these things and enter into his glory? And beginning with Moses and all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself" (24. 25-27); "These are my words which I spoke to you, while I was still with you, that everything written about me in Moses and the prophets and the Psalms must be fulfilled. Then he opened their minds to understand the scriptures, and said to them 'Thus it is written that the Christ should suffer and on the third day rise from the dead, and that repentance and forgiveness of sins should be preached in his name to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem. You are witnesses of these things " (vs. 44-47). It can be said without exaggeration that this imparting of a new understanding of Scripture to which the disciples are to witness is the heart of the resurrection appearances for Luke, and this only shows how important the understanding of Scripture is for him. That the risen Christ actively and thoroughly taught the disciples is underscored by Luke's forty-day tradition in Acts 1. 3. Dupont has shown how the scheme in Lk. 24. 44-47 actually works out in Acts: each of the theological points mentioned proves to be supported by at least one Scripture from law, prophets and writings.[2] But we may ask what the significance of this Lukan theme is for the pre-resurrection period? Clearly, Jesus is frequently using

---

[1]See #25 above.

[2]See #26 above.

the Old Testament, as he does in Luke 4. 16-30. Yet these references to Scripture are not understood at the time: only those who have been taught by the risen Christ can know and hand on their true meaning. Not only that, but their misunderstanding leads to their fulfillment--particularly the event of crucifixion, but also the resurrection and the announcement of forgiveness that proceeds from the resurrection. With such a doctrine of Scripture, is not Luke in a somewhat peculiar position in his treatment of the traditions concerning Jesus' teaching, and especially his Old Testament teaching? I think we can see clearly the uniqueness of his position in his handling of the Nazareth rejection. For there, it is definitely the misunderstanding of Scripture which leads the people to reject Jesus, and this is only typical for his whole ministry: indeed by its position it sets the themes for his whole ministry. Yet if Luke is true to his own understanding of Scripture, these very prophetic passages which enrage the people must have their <u>true</u> meaning which is not open to them. They must in some way reach into the resurrection period and speak of forgiveness as well. And this is what we have sought to bring out in our interpretation of the Nazareth pericope: that these texts do in fact have a dual meaning for Luke; one which leads to the rejection of Jesus and a more hidden meaning which anticipates the forgiveness of the people. It is precisely this dual understanding which gives rise to the difficulty of this passage--the shift from acceptance to rejection. It is this dual meaning which causes Luke to put Jesus in <u>control</u> of the dialogue and lead the people to reject him; yet he knows that beyond that rejection lies the gospel of forgiveness. A similar combination of prophecy and Jesus' control is seen in the two-swords passage. It is interesting to note that in Acts 7,

where a similar episode takes place in the post-resurrection period Luke feels free to make the word of forgiveness quite explicit. I would also point to Acts 10. 43 as evidence that in the post-resurrection period, the dimension of forgiveness in Is. 61. 1-2 (which, as section #78 above has shown, permeates Acts 10. 35-43) can be expressed clearly.

#243. The meaning of "poor" for Luke.--With this detailed study of the banquet parable and the Nazareth pericope behind us, we need now to deal directly with the meaning of the term ptōchos in Luke. The ten references in the Gospel occur in eight separate oontexts. In five of these passages, the meaning of the word seems quite straightforward--a person or persons in poverty. Lk. 18. 22 and 19. 8 speak of giving money to the poor and 16. 20, 22 and 21. 3 describe a person as poor in a way which is made clear by the context to mean a person in poverty. By the analysis given in #217, Lk. 14. 13 belongs here also. The other four passages appear to me to be more ambiguous in meaning. By this I mean simply that the contexts do not make clear that poverty is meant. These passages are 4. 18 (quote from Is. 61. 1), 6. 20 ("Blessed are the poor"), 7. 22 (an allusion to Is. 61. 1) and 14. 21. The last could be taken along with 14. 13 as a reference to the poor in the literal sense. The object of the analysis of this parable above has been to show that this is not the case, but that Is. 61. 1 and other OT passages lie behind this parable and that the "poor, blind, lame.." are here used in a more metaphorical way. The effect of our analysis is to make all these four "ambiguous" passages dependent upon Is. 61. 1 for their meaning. Thus the key question becomes--what does the word "poor" in Is. 61. 1 mean for Luke? To answer simply in the terms of the quotation--the "poor" are those to whom

the good news is preached--is not adequate, for these poor could still be simply those who are in poverty. Our effort to show that the term "poor" means more than poverty begins from two basic insights. The first is that if the term "poor" in the banquet parable is used as a metaphor for the Jewish mission (as most commentators have always understood it), then the door is opened to a metaphorical meaning and we are justified in pressing this direction. The second insight is that the LXX and the Targum have already given this term a metaphorical significance. Especially in the LXX, this and other expressions are used to describe Israel in exile. The point of our excursus on the meaning of "poor" in the OT (#64-72) was to show that once one begins dealing with a metaphorical sense, you encounter a wide diversity of meaning and there is no justification for simplifying this into one explanation that the "poor" are Israel or the "poor" are the pious, etc. But it is equally clear that the OT and the versions, especially in Isaiah, prepare the way for a metaphorical use of the word. And since Luke has used Isaiah so fully, there has seemed to be good reason to explore these possibilities. The results are not easily summed up, however. The term appears to have several nuances for Luke. In the context of the banquet parable, it has the nuance of "outcast" listed as it is with the lame and the blind who are brought in from the highways and byways. At the same time the meaning of the parable as a whole suggests that these are in some way metaphorical for those who are the objects of the mission of the Church. The Old Testament background of the parable supports and amplifies this suggestion and suggests most strongly that these terms, including "poor," are metaphors for Israel in exile. At the same time, the development of this banquet motif

directs us to other banquet passages in Luke where we find another motif--Jesus eats with tax-collectors and sinners. The linguistic evidence that the term ptōchos is found 10 times in the Gospel but not in Acts, the term hamartōlos is used 18 times in the Gospel but not at all in Acts, and telōnes 10 times in the Gospel and not in Acts, gives confirmation both to the suggestion that these terms are associated by Luke (through the common element of "banquet") and that he is using them in a deliberate way. The Isaianic background provided by the analysis of the banquet midrash adds to the meaning of the term the nuance that the "poor" are, in a broad sense, the objects of God's gracious acts. An obvious question at this point is how the literal use of the term is related to its more metaphorical use. Again, the parable of the banquet may provide the clue in the nature of the excuses of the invited guests. There an intrinsic link is revealed between an involvement in the world and the rejection of God's invitation to the banquet. This is in harmony with the Gospel as a whole where the rich are generally those who are not open to the message of John the Baptist (the Pharisees are lovers of money--Lk. 16. 14; they are also those who reject God's purposes for them--7. 30) or Jesus, whereas the poor are. But this way of looking at things is competing in Luke's theology with another perspective which would downplay and even obliterate such a distinction. Some have claimed that there is a kind of Ebionism in Luke. But Conzelmann is right, I think, when he says that "We cannot speak of an ideal of poverty either in the Gospels or in Acts."[1] He is right, too, I think when he says that the "Ebionism of

---

[1]Conzelmann, Theology of Luke, p. 233.

Lk. 6. 20 comes from the source." There is no doubt that Luke has not created the distinction between rich and poor but has received it in the tradition. But I do not think Conzelmann is right when he goes on to say that this is "not developed as a theme by Luke."[1] It is certainly not laid down as a timeless principle, but it is developed as a theme. The linguistic data given above about the occurrance of the term in the Gospel but not in Acts suggests a deliberate treatment. Of course it is true that Acts 4. 34 says "There was not a needy person among them." But that does not explain Luke's use of words. Conzelmann himself is probably right in saying that such a statement is intended to say less about the economics of the early church and more about its unity.[2] Our answer to this problem is that Luke has accepted the distinction between rich and poor, even heightened it, but only to serve his theological theme of guilt and forgiveness. He wants to make the distinction only to show that it is obliterated by the Cross and Resurrection. Both the rich and the poor are shown to be guilty--this is driven home by the Passion narrative in which the complete isolation of Jesus is emphasized. At the same time, to both rich and poor is extended the post-resurrection message of repentance and forgiveness. That is why Luke no longer uses the terms poor and rich and sinner, etc. after the resurrection--he does not want the lines of acceptance and rejection to be drawn simply along the old pattern. The Cross has revealed that none are sinners in distinction from others--all are sinners. It is the same with rich and poor. The parable of the banquet makes clear that those involved in the world are

---

[1] Ibid. [2] Ibid.

still invited. Their refusal to come because of their involvement only reveals that they do not recognize the urgency of the time; they do not understand what the resurrection has done for them. On the other hand, the poor who are brought into the house are not simply the impovrished, but more--those who receive the good news. The OT background shows that they are the Jews first and foremost. But they are the Gentiles too. Within the structure of the parable itself, the second sending of the servant may well be also to the poor, etc. Isaiah provides a background which makes possible the association of the word "poor" with both Jews and Gentiles. In Is. 61.1 the poor are most clearly exiled Jews. But in Is. 25 they are more closely associated with "the nations." Thus "poor" takes on universalistic nuances. It comes to express the graciousness and hospitality of God toward all men. Here we see the contrast with the Dead Sea Scrolls (#70) where the term contains an exclusive doctrine of election. In conclusion, it may be said that it is difficult to reduce the meaning of this term for Luke to a neat formula. The attempt to do so stumbles over the richness of the texts themselves.

Excursus: The Continuity Between Jesus and Luke

#244. Indications of Luke's contact with earlier traditions. --At several points I have promised to make some suggestions as to how I conceive Luke's relation to the tradition before him, particularly to Jesus. This is only a side issue, for our main concern has been to understand Luke's own thought. But certain clues may at least be pulled together here in a short excursus. In the textual study of Mt. 11.5 we encountered in the Syriac

tradition a variation from Is. 61. 1. The Sy^{cur} read ܡܬܬܪܥܝܢ ܡܣܟܝܢ "the poor are sustained" and one MS. of the Syriac Lectionary read ܡܣܟܝܢ ... "the poor are made happy." (See ##136, 143). The Sy^{cur} reading is clearly an allusion to the feeding of the poor, as thus from the perspective we have developed in this chapter, could be regarded as an allusion to the Messianic Banquet. The Aramaic word bsm, which underlies the Syriac Lectionary reading, also frequently has the meaning--"to be happy as the result of being filled with good food and drink"-- and thus also could be an allusion to the Banquet. (#149). It is conceivable that it is such an allusion which underlies the Persian Diatessaron (#144). In other words, there may already have been an allusion to the Messianic Banquet in the original form of the tradition we find in Mt. 11. 5//Lk., 7. 22 which is preserved in the Syriac, and has disturbed the textual history of Mt. 11. 5. Moreover it is possible to see how Luke could substitute Is. 61. 1 for this allusion. Not only does he have a great interest in this text, but Is. 61. 1 would also be for him an allusion to the Messianic Banquet. For example, if as we suggested in #157, Luke found some form of Ps. 37. 11 here--"the anawim shall possess the land and delight themselves in abundant prosperity," we can see how easily this text could be associated by him with Is. 61. 1-6 and its context. They would have in common the word anawim, and "delight themselves in abundant prosperity" would tally with "eat the wealth of nations" (61. 6). Yet it is also possible that he is not the first to associate Is. 61. 1 with the messianic banquet. We know from the Dead Sea Pesher (Ps. 37. 11 (See #153f), that Is. 61. 1 and Ps. 37. 11 were linked by them. It is equally clear that we have a pre-Lukan use of Is. 61. 1 in the Beatitudes, and it may well be that the Lukan form of the

Beatitudes, with their strong allusions to the banquet theme, is not his own creation entirely (See #215). In other words, we may be dealing here with what Conzelmann has called a "pre-Lukan motif stereotyped by Luke." (See page 125, note 1 above). I would make another tentative suggestion. If the original form of Lk. 7. 22 ended with a reference to the poor taking part in the messianic banquet, this may be the original grounds for the saying about offense which immediately follows. For the one clue we have as to the point of possible offense between Jesus and John is in Lk. 7. 33-34//Mt. 11, 18-19:

> For John the Baptist has come eating no bread and drinking no wine; and you say 'He has a demon.' The Son of man has come eating and drinking, and you say 'Behold a glutton and a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors and sinners!'

I would simply suggest that the offense to John which Jesus anticipates in his answer to him is his participation as "the one who is to come" with the poor, the sinful and the outcast in the anticipation of the messianic banquet. That would mean that as much as healing and forgiveness of sins, Jesus' eating with the outcast was a sign of the approaching kingdom. But for some reason, this was offensive to John. The question is--can we say anything about this pre-Lukan Christian interpretation of Is. 61. 1? Is it possible to trace it back to Jesus himself? If so, in what context did he use it? I would take the answer of Jesus to John at its face value and suggest that this is a possible context for Jesus' own interpretation of Is. 61. 1. This means that we must speculate on the relation between Jesus and John. This is very difficult to do mainly for the reasons pointed out by Robinson in the article summarized above in section #119. The actual relation between them, particularly on the point of the relation of each to Elijah, has undoubtedly been overlayed to a

considerable extent by the early Christian belief that John was Elijah and that he was the forerunner of Christ. But it is quite conceivable that there was actual rivalry between John and Jesus not so much as to who was Elijah, but on their interpretation of Elijah. For as we have seen in chapter iv, the interpretation of Elijah tended to go in two directions--the "earthly" Elijah was a stern judge; the eschatological Elijah was a reconciling, peace-bringing figure (#206). I would thus make another tentative suggestion--that John interpreted Elijah according to the earthly model and that Jesus interpreted Elijah according to the eschatological model which brought Elijah in the direction of the prophet Isaiah. I would suggest further that also involved in this rivalry between Jesus and John was the interpretation of Is. 61. 1ff. This is an extrapolation out of the contrast between Jesus and John in Lk. 7. 33-34, which because of its reference to eating and drinking may contain within it reflection on the messianic banquet and thus upon Is. 61. 1. In other words, while up to now we have been interested in Luke's midrashic activity within the LXX and his development of this theme within the Gospel and Acts, we are now simply taking cognizance of the fact that Luke was not the first to interpret Is. 61. 1, and that even within the context of Jesus' own teaching, Is. 61. 1 may have been interpreted in reference to the messianic banquet. This would mean that Luke may have found a hint in the tradition which he has elaborated upon. There is no way of knowing this, but neither is there anything intrinsically improbable about it. I now want to simply point out that the Dead Sea Scroll interpretation of Is. 61. 1 and Luke's interpretation are almost diametrically opposite, and that the confrontation between Jesus and John could have been the historical point of contact between these two

interpretations. This means accepting the current hypothesis that John had some contact with this community or one like it. We may briefly summarize the contrast between Qumran and Luke:[1]

(1) Vengeance. Luke has removed the idea of vengeance from the quotation in 4. 19 and this is borne out in the meaning of the Nazareth pericope as a whole which, as we have seen, points ahead not to vengeance but forgiveness. By contrast, the idea of vengeance and the theme of a "day of vengeance" is prominent in the Qumran writings. 1QS ix. 23--"He is to be zealous to carry out every ordinance punctiliously, against the day of vengeance (yom naqam)." 1QM vii. 4-5--"No lame or blind man or halt man or one with a permanent blemish in his flesh or a man afflicted with the uncleanness of his flesh--none of these shall go with them to battle; they shall all be volunteers for war, blameless in spirit and flesh and ready for the day of vengeance (yom naqam)." The phrase yom naqam is the same expression found in Is. 61. 2. The exclusion of the blind and lame may be contrasted with Lk. 14. 21 where the blind and lame are among those brought into the messianic banquet.

(2) Spirit-anointing. Luke has taken this feature of Is. 61. 1 in the direction of resurrection/forgiveness which opens up the inclusion of Jews and Gentiles in the post-resurrection fellowship; he also seems to see inherent in the anointing by Spirit the necessity that one so anointed must suffer rejection by his people, a theme closely related to the first. In the DSS writings, Spirit-anointing means a special knowledge of God and of Scripture which leads to a more exacting knowledge of and obedience to God's will not available to ordinary men and thus ultimately to a hatred of those not granted this knowledge. Or put in another way, in Luke, Spirit leads to a universalism whereas in DSS it leads to a high and exclusive doctrine of election. See #69 above for our interpretation of Hodayoth 18 where this is spelled out. A key text is IQS iv. 20-21--"He will sprinkle upon him the spirit of truth to cleanse him of all the abomination of falsehood and of all pollution through the spirit of filth; to the end that being made upright, men may have understanding of transcendental knowledge (of the Most High) and of the wisdom of the sons of heaven to instruct the perfect in the way. For God has chosen them for an eternal covenant and theirs is the glory of all men." (See B. Rigaux, "Révélation des Mystères et Perfection à Qumran et dans le Nouveau Testament," NTS, IV (July, 1958), pp. 237-262 for a full discussion of this feature of Qumran thought).

(3) Poor. We have already called attention to the contrast between the meaning the Dead Sea Scrolls attach to this term and the meaning it has in Luke. The contrast is essentially the same as that seen above in

---

[1]Quotations from the Qumran materials are from T. H. Gaster, The Dead Sea Scriptures.

connection with the Spirit. See #70 and #243.

(4) rason--dektos. The word dektos occurs three times in Luke: in the quotation from Is. 61. 1 in 4. 18--"acceptable year of the Lord," in 4. 24 ("no prophet is acceptable") and in Acts 10. 35--"In every race... the one who fears him...is acceptable to him." See #78 and #239 above. In the Nazareth pericope, there is a play on the irony that the one who announces the acceptable year of the Lord is not acceptable (already Brun, see #85). Acts 10 shows that for Luke, Is. 61. 1 looks ahead to God's eschatological acceptance of men, both Jew and Gentile. The term rason is a very common one in the DSS, but there it is a technical expression for that more demanding and exacting knowledge of and obedience to God's will which is at the foundation of the Qumran community. IQS v. 1 and 10 are typical--"The members of the community... have declared their readiness to turn away from all evil and to adhere to all that God in his good pleasure has commanded (bekhol asher siwwah lirsono)." ... to adhere to the truth of God and to walk according to his pleasure (wulhittallek birsono). He that so commits himself is to keep apart from all forward men (ʾanshe-haʿawel) that walk in the path of wickedness.. inasmuch as they have never sought or studied God's ordinances in order to find out on what more arcane points they may guiltily have gone astray..," See also 1QS ix. 24 (where yom naqam and rason are together, as in Is. 61. 2). The essance of this contrast is that Luke is seeking to include those within God's promises who do not keep the Law, whereas the DSS make a rigid exclusion of all those who do not keep it as strictly as themselves.

I offer these contrasts, pointing out the extent to which they involve an interpretation of Is. 61. 1 and suggesting that Luke, whatever he himself has undoubtedly done in the interpretation of this text, may have found the seed of his own interpretation in the traditions concerning the confrontation between Jesus and John the Baptist, and that John the Baptist may have represented a view similar to that found in the Dead Sea Scrolls materials. This is of course a speculative suggestion, and it is offered for whatever it is worth as an appendix to our main thesis which concerns Luke's own method and thought.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

#245. The main thesis. --The main thesis of this study has been that the author of the Gospel of Luke has intentionally interwoven into much of the Gospel and Acts themes inherent in Is. 61. 1-6. This thesis may be regarded as a detailed elaboration of the insight that Is. 61. 1-2, in conjunction with Is. 58. 6, is the only significant and extended Old Testament quotation which is peculiar to the Third Gospel (Lk. 4. 18-19). Our analysis has focused upon material which is peculiarly Lukan: the Nazareth pericope, the Parable of the Great Supper in Luke 14. 16-30, and the "Elijah theology" of the Gospel which is related to the interpretation of Is. 61. 1. The thesis that this peculiar Lukan material is influenced by Is. 61. 1 is not entirely novel. T. W. Manson in The Teaching of Jesus has remarked, "In Q, Jesus is the Prophet; in M, the Rabbi, however unorthodox; in L he is the One who fulfills the prophecy in Is. 61. 1 and 58. 6."[1] The originality of our study lies in three areas: (a) the extent to which it seeks to uncover the influence of Is. 61. 1 in the Gospel; (b) the method which it believes was used by Luke in his interpretation of this text and (c) the attempt to place Luke's interpretation against a background of Jewish exegesis. More specifically, the originality of this study lies in its assertion that Luke's interpretation of Is. 61. 1ff is essentially a midrash on this text which has related it with other OT passages

---

[1]T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus (Cambridge: The University Press, 1963), p. 43.

dealing mainly with the messianic banquet, and that this midrashic exegesis has been carried out in the LXX primarily by means of the technique of "enriching," i. e. of elaborating on the meaning of a passage by importing into it the meaning of another passage with which it is linked by similar vocabulary and themes. Thus from one perspective, this study has set out data which is comparable to but distinct from that offered by Selwyn, Doeve, Gertner and others. This study has taken a certain viewpoint as a working hypothesis and endeavored to see how much it can yield. The resultant data does not always harmonize with the conclusions of general Lukan studies nor even always with the insights of the above mentioned more specialized investigations. We are not yet at a point in Lukan studies when the definitive study can be written which would synthesize fully all the valid and sound insights of separate studies. The present study is a separate and limited study, offered to scholarship as a necessary aspect of some future synthesis. In this concluding chapter we will only briefly indicate the implications of our own study for the larger questions of Lukan scholarship.

#246. The interpretation of Is. 61. 1 in the present study compared with that of Lindars. --First of all we may say something about the results of our study compared with the analysis of Lindars (#81-82). From our standpoint the situation is much more complex than Lindars would have us think, and his reconstruction of a fairly neat progression in the interpretation of Is. 61. 1 from its use in resurrection apologetic to a basis for a messianic ministry and finally to a justification for the Gentile mission does not do justice to the facts. As far as I can see, the dimensions of resurrection, suffering, healing and universalism may all be implicit in the interpretation of Is. 61. 1 even in

pre-Christian Jewish exegesis. In any case, within the New Testament it is difficult to separate these themes and string them out into an historical development. Furthermore, Is. 61. 1 is clearly a popular text and probably more influential than Lindars suggests by his subordinate treatment of it. Finally, he has I believe quite missed its real significance for Luke. It is a summary for the ministry of Jesus, but more than that, it is by means of this text that Luke has oriented Jesus' ministry toward a situation of the early church--its Jewish-Gentile situation--in such a way that Jesus' ministry provides a theological interpretation for that situation. The interpretation of Is. 61. 1 within the larger context of the messianic banquet is not an esoteric interest of Luke. It brings out the true significance of Jesus' eating and drinking with sinners as a sign of the Kingdom; it likewise goes to the heart of the early church's table fellowship which brought Jews and Gentiles together in a way that went far beyond the boundary of the old Law but fulfilled God's ancient promises which Luke clearly sees have always included both Israel and the Gentiles. Thus we offer our own study of Is. 61. 1ff. both as a corrective to Lindars but also as a substantial supplement to his assessment of its influence upon Luke-Acts.

#247. Luke's Sitz im Leben. --Luke's use of the LXX along with many features of his style clearly shows him to be a Hellenist. But his acquaintance with Jewish midrashic techniques and traditions must surely also mark him as a Jew. Yet in contrast to Matthew, Luke is probably more distant from Palestinian Judaism and rabbinic thought. This would suggest that he is in fact a Hellenistic Jew, to whom the traditions of Judaism have been mediated through the Hellenistic synagogue. The content of the worship of

the first century Hellenistic Synagogue, especially its commentary upon Scripture, are not well known to us. The LXX and Philo give us a fairly full picture of Alexandrian Judaism, but Alexandrian Judaism is pretty clearly somewhat extraordinary within Hellenistic Judaism and Philo is probably a special case within Alexandrian Judaism. Nevertheless one probably does not go too wide of the mark if he imagines that the Hellenistic Jewish homilies were not too different from those preserved for us in Hebrew and Aramaic, at least in their being a bearer of an infinite variety of midrashic traditions. It is here that we can best see Luke learning of Jewish exegetical techniques as well as traditions. Thus we must qualify the statement of Feine-Behm-Kümmel: "Upon the basis of the Gospel of Luke, only one thing can be said with certainty about its author--he was a Gentile Christian."[1] We would say that he was certainly a Hellenistic Jew or at least God-fearer, who has accepted Christianity. There are perhaps also some implications from our study for the dating of the Gospel. We have in the foregoing study built upon the view that Luke has used the Gospel of Mark. In our interpretation of the Nazareth pericope, we have seen Luke going over the Markan version of Jesus' visit to Nazareth and pulling out all of its implications in order to elaborate

---

[1]Paul Feine, Johannes Behm and Werner G. Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, trans., A.J. Mattill, Jr. (14th Revised Ed., Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965), p. 105. The support given by the authors for this generalization is: (a) Luke has no knowledge of Palestinian geography (accepting Conzelmann's thesis); (b) his avoidance of Semitic words except amēn; (c) he changes Palestinian features of the tradition to Hellenistic and omits certain aspects of Jesus' polemic with the Pharisees. It should be pointed out that all these arguments speak only for Luke's Hellenist background, but do not really deal with the question of his religious background. We may mention that E.C. Selwyn has also argued that Luke was a Hellenistic Jew (#27 above).

upon them or correct them. I think this implies some distance between Luke and Mark. We have even suggested that Luke has searched in Mark for "clues" to the understanding of his own time in a way similar to his approach to the Old Testament. This does not mean that Luke puts Mark on the level with Scripture. It does mean that the words and actions of Jesus in the Markan narrative have taken on for Luke a meaning which is appropriate not only for Jesus' own situation but also for Luke's. This also might indicate a certain sense of distance between Mark's testimony to Jesus and Luke. We have occasionally indicated points of similarity between Luke and Paul, especially Romans 11. What is the significance of this? One might use this to argue that Luke was in fact a companion of Paul. Or one could use it to argue that he knew the Pauline epistles. Neither of these views receives much support today. Thus our data could be said to call for a re-examination of the prevailing opinions. But I am not sure that this need be the only conclusion. Luke could be an author who was not a companion of Paul, nor acquainted with the epistles, but who, in his effort to deal with a problem similar to that in Romans 9-11 (the destiny of Israel), turned to a developed apologetic-exegetical tradition which itself could have been shaped partly by Jewish traditions, and from which Luke and Paul both drew, each in his own way, thus showing from our perspective some similarities but certainly also some important divergencies.

#248. Luke's style. --It is clear that we have accepted as valid Conzelmann's basic approach to Luke as a systematic writer and thinker who carefully constructs subtle anticipations and fulfillments within his own corpus. At the same time we have disagreed with Conzelmann on several specific

points points of interpretation. Our analysis supplements Conzelmann particularly in the area of Luke's interpretation of Scripture. His section on the meaning of Scripture for Luke (Theology of Luke, pp. 157-162) is one of the least satisfying. His remark that "The horizon of Old Testament prophecy is... limited; it reaches as far as the coming of the Spirit (Luke 24. 49) and the dawn of the Eschaton (Acts 2. 16ff.), but not as far as the Kingdom of God," remains partly incomprehensible to me. When he goes on to say that "Only Jesus' prophecy touches on this," I am more confused because of the extent to which Jesus' prophecy in Luke is steeped in the OT and because of the lines of continuity I see between Jesus and Luke in this area. Our own understanding of Luke's view of Scripture is set forth above in #242. Despite our differences with Conzelmann, our own view accepts and builds upon the assumption that Luke has made a basic division between the time of Jesus and his own time. Luke writes with a strong sense of an unfolding of the history of salvation and of divisions within that history, so that his style, his method of composition, his choice of vocabulary, are affected. He senses that certain words and themes are appropriate for one time, and others for another. Yet underneath these divisions there runs a basic continuity which makes it possible for him to draw subtle lines back and forth across the supposed boundaries of epochs. Thus I doubt that a view of distinct aeons can be pressed as relentlessly as Conzelmann has done it. This is not only because Luke deliberately complicates such distinctions himself, but also because he is not utterly consistent. The reader has undoubtedly noticed that not everything can be wrapped up into a neat package. The summary on the meaning of "poor" for Luke makes this perfectly clear (#243). Here the warning

of Cadbury is well taken--we cannot force all the material in the Gospel into the framework of a single perspective or intention.[1] The traditions received by Luke and the other Evangelists came out of a mixture of motives and they did not always try to harmonize them. However, like Conzelmann, we have focused upon the material peculiar to Luke. One could proceed on the assumption that this material has come to Luke through oral transmission and is only superficially shaped by him, but one can also try to see it as containing a peculiar Lukan viewpoint. We have adopted the latter assumption. By concentrating upon the Old Testament background of this material we allow more flexibility than Conzelmann because OT exegetical traditions are by their very nature more diversified, more complex and even more ambiguous than theological motifs. We have tried to avoid imposing a scheme upon the material, as we believe both Conzelmann and Lindars have often done, in order to let the texts speak in all their diversity.

---

[1]An example of Cadbury's view is found in H. J. Cadbury, "Mixed Motives in the Gospels," American Philosophical Society: Proceedings, XCV (1951), pp. 117-124.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Texts and Translations

Berliner, A. (ed.). Targum Onkelos. Berlin: Gorzelanczyk and Company, 1884.

Blackman, Philip (ed. and trans.). Mishnayoth. London: Mishna Press, 1952.

Burrows, Millar. The Dead Sea Scrolls. New York: The Viking Press, 1965.

_____. More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Secker and Warburg, 1958.

Ceriani, Antonio Maria (ed.). Translations Syra Pescitto Veteris Testamenti Ex Codice Ambrosiano Sec. Fere VI; Photolithigraphice Edita. 4 parts. London: Williams and Norgate, 1876-1883.

Cureton, William (ed. and trans.). Remains of a Very Antient Recension of the Four Gospels in Syriac. London: John Murray, 1858.

Danby, Herbert (ed. and trans.). The Mishnah. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.

deLergarde, Paul (ed.). Hagiographa Chaldaice. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1873.

Epstein, I. (ed.). The Babylonian Talmud. London: The Soncino Press, 1935-1938.

Freedman, H. (ed.). Midrash Rabbah. 10 Vols. London: Soncino Press, 1939.

Gaster, T. H. (ed. and trans.). The Dead Sea Scriptures in English Translation. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1956.

Ginsburger, M. (ed.). Pseudo-Jonathan; Thargum Jonathan ben Usiel zum Pentateuch; nach der Londoner Handschrift. Berlin: S. Calvary and Company, 1903.

_____. (ed.). Das Fragmententhargum; Thargum jeruschalmi zum Pentateuch. Berlin: S. Calvary and Company, 1899.

Habermann, A. M. (ed.). Megilloth Midbar Yehuda; The Scrolls from the Judean Desert. Jerusalem: Machbaroth Lesifruth Publishing House, 1959.

James, M. R. (ed. and trans.). The Apocryphal New Testament. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1924.

_____. (ed. and trans.). The Biblical Antiquities of Philo. ("Translations of Early Documents; Series I: Palestinian Jewish Texts; Pre-Rabbinic") London: S. P. C. K., 1917.

Jülicher, A. (ed.). Itala; Das Neue Testament in altlateinischer Über lieferung. 4 Vols. Berlin, 1938-1954.

Kisch, Guido (ed.). Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatem Biblacarum. ("The University of Notre Dame: Publications in Mediaeval Studies," Vol. X.) Notre Dame, 1949.

Kittel, R. (ed.). Biblia Hebraica. 8th Ed. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württem-bergische Bibelanstalt, 1952.

Kuhn, Karl Georg (ed. and trans.). Der Tannaitische Midrasch Sifre zu Numeri. ("Rabbinische Text," Vol. II, No. 3). Stuttgart: W. Kohl-hammer, 1959.

Lauterbach, Jacob Z. (ed. and trans.). Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael. 2 Vols. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1949.

Leloir, Louis (ed.). Saint Ephraem Commentaire de l'Evangile Concordant. ("Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium," Vol. CXXXVII).

Levi, Israel (ed.). The Hebrew Text of the Book of Ecclesiastes. ("Semitic Study Series," No. 3). Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1951.

Lewis, Agnes Smith (ed.). The Old Syriac Gospels or Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe. London: Williams and Norgate, 1910.

Lewis, Agnes Smith, and Gibson, Margaret Dunlop (eds.). The Palestinian Syriac Lectionary of the Gospels; Re-edited from Two Sinai MSS and from P. de Largarde's Edition of the 'Evangeliarum Hierosolymitanum'. London: Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., 1899.

Mansoor, Menahem (ed. and trans.). The Thanksgiving Hymns. ("Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah," Vol. III) Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961.

Martin, Victor, and Kasser, Rudolphe (eds.). Papyrus Bodmer xiv; Evangile Luc, chap. 3-24 (p79). Cologne-Geneva, Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1961.

Messina, Giuseppe, S. J. (ed.). Diatessaron Persiano. ("Biblica et Orientalia," No. 14.) Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1951.

Nestle, Eberhard and Nestle, Erwin (eds.). Novum Testamentum Graece. 20th ed. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1950.

Rahlfs, Alfred (ed.). Septuaginta. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Wurttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935.

Rauer, Max (ed.). Origenes Werke: Die Homilien zu Lukas in der Ubersetzung des Hieronymus und Die Griechischen Reste der Homilien und des Lukas-Kommentars. ("Die Griechischen Christ lichen Schriftsteller der Ersten Jahrhunderte," Origen, Vol. IX.) Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1959.

Sperber, Alexander (ed.). The Bible in Aramaic; Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts. 3 Vols. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1959-1962.

Stenning, J. F. (ed. and trans.). The Targum of Isaiah. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949.

Tischendorf, Constantine (ed.). Novum Testamentum Graece, Editio Octava Critica Maior. Leipzig: Giesecke and Devrient, 1869.

Windfuhr, Walter (ed. and trans.). Die Tosefta; Seder VI: Toharot (Tractates 1-3). ("Rabbinische Texte," Vol. VI, No. 1). Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1960.

Wordsworth, John, Sanday, W. White, H.J. (eds.). Portions of the Gospels According to St. Mark and St. Matthew from the Bobbio MS (k). ("Old Latin Biblical Texts," No. 2). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1886.

Ziegler, Joseph (ed.). Isaias. ("Septuaginta, Vetera Testamentum Graecum; Auctoritate Societas Litterarum Gottingensis editum," Vol. XIV.) Gottingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1939.

Lexicons, Concordances

Indices and Dictionaries

Bauer, Walter, Arndt, William F., and Gingrich, F. Wilbur. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Goodspeed, Edgar J. Index Patristicus sive Clavis Patrum Apostolicorum Operum. Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1960.

Hatch, Edwin, and Redpath, Henry A. A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament Including the Apocryphal Books. 2 Vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1897.

Jastrow, Marcus. A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature. New York: Verlag Choreb, 1926.

Kuhn, Karl Georg, et al. Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1960.

Levy, J. Chaldaisches Worterbuch uber die Targumim und einen grossen Theil des Rabbinischen Schriftums. Leipzig: Baumgartner's Buchhandlung, 1881.

Morgenthaler, Robert. Statistik des Neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes. Zurich: Gotthelf-Verlag, 1958.

Payne-Smith, R., et al. Thesaurus Syricus. 2 Vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1879-1901.

Schmoller, Alfred. Handkonkordanz zum Griechischen Neuen Testament. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Wurttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1949.

Books

Birkeland, Harris. ʿani und ʿanaw in den Psalmen. ("Skrifter utgitt av det Norske Videnskapsakademi i Oslo," Vol. II, No. 4.) Oslo, 1933.

_____. Die Feinde des Individuums in der israelitischen Psalmen-literature. Oslo, 1933.

_____. The Evildoers in the Book of Psalms. ("Avhandlinger utgitt av det Norske Videnskapsakademie i Oslo," II: Hist.-Filos. Klasse, No. 2.) Oslo: Kommisjon Hos Jacob Dybwad, 1955.

Black, Matthew. An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954.

Brownlee, William Hugh. The Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls for the Bible; With Special Attention to the Book of Isaiah. New York; Oxford University Press, 1964.

Bultmann, Rudolph. The History of the Synoptic Tradition. Tr. by John Marsh. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963.

Cadbury, Henry J. The Making of Luke-Acts. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1927.

_____. The Style and Literary Method of Luke. ("Harvard Theological Studies," Vol. VI.) Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1919-1920.

Conzelmann, Hans. The Theology of St. Luke. Tr. by Geoffrey Buswell. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.

Creed, John Martin. The Gospel According to Luke. London: MacMillan and Company, 1930.

Dalman, Gustav. Jesus-Jeshua. Tr. by Paul P. Levertoff. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1929.

_____. The Words of Jesus. Tr. by D. M. Kay. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1930.

Daube, David. The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism. London: University of London, the Athelone Press, 1956.

Dodd, C. H. According to the Scriptures; the Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology. Digswell Place: James Nesbitt and Company, 1961.

_____. The Parables of the Kingdom. Rev. ed. London: Fontana Books, 1961.

Doeve, J. W. Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts. Assen, Netherlands: Van Gorcum and Company, N. V., 1954.

Ellis, Earle. Paul's Use of the Old Testament. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957.

Easton, B. S. The Gospel According to St. Luke; A Critical and Exegetical Commentary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926.

Finkel, Asher. The Pharisees and the Teacher of Nazareth. ("Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spatjudentums und Urchristentums,") Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964.

Fohrer, Georg. Elia. "Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments," No. 31.) Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1957.

Freed, Edwin D. The Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John. ("Supplements to Novum Testamentum," Vol. XI.) Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1965.

Ginzberg, Louis. The Legends of the Jews. 7 Vols. Tr. by Henrietta Szold. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1910-1946.

Grant, Robert M., and Freedman, David Noel. The Secret Sayings of Jesus. With an English Translation of the Gospel of Thomas by William R. Schoedel. London: Fontana Books, 1960.

Grundmann, Walter. Das Evangelium nach Lukas. ("Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament," No. 3.) 2nd ed. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961.

Guilding, Aileen. The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship; A Study of the Relation of St. John's Gospel to the Ancient Jewish Lectionary System. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1960.

Hatch, Edwin. Essays in Biblical Greek. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1889.

Hawkins, J.C. Horae Synopticae. 2nd ed. rev. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1909.

Haenchen, Ernst. Die Apostelgeschichte. ("Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar uber das Neue Testament," No. 3.) 11th ed. Gottingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1957.

Jeremias, Joachim. Jesus' Promise to the Nations. ("Studies in Biblical Theology," No. 24.) Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, 1958.

Kahle, Paul E. The Cairo Geniza. 2nd ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1959.

Klostermann, Erich. Das Lukasevangelium. ("Handbuch zum Neuen Testament.") 2nd ed. Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1929.

Kümmel, Werner Georg. Promise and Fulfillment. ("Studies in Biblical Theology," No. 23.) Tr. Dorothea M. Barton. Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, 1958.

Leany, A.R.C. A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke. ("Harper's New Testament Commentaries") New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.

Lindars, Barnabas. New Testament Apologetic; the Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961.

Lund, Nils Wilhelm. Chiasmus in the New Testament. Chapel Hill, N.C.: The University of North Carolina Press, 1942.

Mann, Jacob. The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue; A Study in the Cycles of the Readings from Torah and Prophets, as well as from Psalms, and in the Structure of Midrashic Homilies. Vol. I: The Palestinian Triennial Cycle; Genesis and Exodus. Cincinnati, Ohio: Hebrew Union College, 1940.

Moore, George Foot. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era; the Age of the Tannaim. 3 Vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932.

Morgenthaler, Robert. Die Lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis. ("Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments," Vols.

14 and 15.) Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1949.

Odeberg, Hugo. Trito-Isaiah (Isaiah 56-66); A Literary and Linguistic Analysis. ("Uppsala Universitets Arsskrift; Theologi," Vol. I.) Uppsala; A-B Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1931.

Percy, Ernst. Die Botschaft Jesu. ("Lunds Universitets Arsskrift," N. F. Vol. XLIX.) Lund: C, W.K. Gleerup, 1953.

Plummer, Alfred. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke. ("The International Critical Commentary") 5th ed. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1922.

Schlatter, Adolf. Das Evangelium des Lukas aus Seinen Quellen Erklart. Stuttgart: Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1931.

Schmid, Josef. Das Evangelium nach Lukas. ("Regensburger Neues Testament," No. 3.) Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1960.

Seeligmann, I. L. The Septuagint Version of Isaiah; A Discussion of its Problems. ("Mededelingen en Verhandelingen," No. 9.) Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1948.

Selwyn, Edward Carus. The Christian Prophets and the Prophetic Apocalypse. London: MacMillan and Company, 1900.

_____. St. Luke the Prophet. London: MacMillan and Company, 1901.

_____. The Oracles in the New Testament. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1911.

_____. First Christian Ideas. London: John Murray, 1919.

Smend, Rudolf. Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1906.

Smith, Morton. Tannaitic Parallels to the Gospels. ("Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series," Vol. VI.) Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1951.

Stendahl, Krister. The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament. ("Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis," Vol. XX.) Uppsala, 1954.

Strack, Hermann L., and Billerbeck, Paul. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. 4 Vols. Munich: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1922-1928.

Swete, Henry Barclay. An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1914.

Vermes, Geza. Scripture and Tradition in Judaism; Haggadic Studies. ("Studia Post-Biblica.") Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961.

Wellhausen, J. Das Evangelium Lucae. Berlin: Georg Reimar, 1904.

Wilcox, Max. The Semitisms of Acts. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1965.

Articles

Anderson, Hugh. "Broadening Horizons: The Rejection at Nazareth Pericope of Luke 4:16-30 in Light of Recent Critical Trends," Interpretation, XVIII (1964), 259-275.

Baltzer, Klaus. "The Meaning of the Temple in the Lukan Writings," Harvard Theological Review, XVIII (July, 1965), 263-277.

Bammel, Ernst. "Ptōchos," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. G. Kittel, and G. Friedrich, VI, 888-915.

Beare, Francis W. "The Parable of the Guests at the Banquet: A Sketch of the History of its Interpretation," The Joy of Study, ed. Sherman E. Johnson. New York: MacMillan Co., 1951, 1-14.

Brun, Lyder. "Der Besuch Jesu in Nazareth nach Lukas," Symbolae Osleonsis Auspiciis Societatis Graeco-Latinae, Fasc. Supplement No. 4: Serta Rudbergiana (1931), 7-17.

Buchler, A. "The Reading of the Law and Prophets in a Triennial Cycle," Jewish Quarterly Review, V (1893), 420-468; VI (1894), 1-73.

Driver, S. R. "Poor," Dictionary of the Bible, ed. James Hastings, IV (1911), 19-20.

Dupont, Dom Jacques. "L'Utilization Apologetique de L'Ancien Testament dans les Discours des Actes," Ephemerides Theologicae Lovaniensis, XXIX (1953), 289-327.

Finkel, Asher. "Jesus' Sermon at Nazareth," Abraham Unser Vater, ed. Otto Betz, et al., (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963), 106-115.

Fitzmeyer, Joseph A. " '4Q Testimonia' and the New Testament," Theological Studies, XVIII (Dec., 1957), 513-537.

Flusser, David. "Blessed Are the Poor in Spirit...," Israel Exploration Journal, X (1960), 1-13.

Gerhardsson, Birger. "The Good Samaritan--The Good Shepherd?" Coniectanea Neotestamentica, XVI (1958), 1-31.

Gertner, M. "Midrashim in the New Testament," Journal of Semitic Studies, VII (Autumn, 1962), 267-292.

Jeremias, Joachim. "Hēlias," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. G. Kittel, II, 930-943.

Klijn, A. F. J. "Stephen's Speech, Acts 7," New Testament Studies, IV (1958), 25-31.

Linnemann, Eta. "Uberlegungen zur Parabel vom grossen Abendmahl; Lk. 14. 15-24/Mt. 22. 1-14," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, LI (1960), 246-255.

Manson, T. W. "The Old Testament in the Teaching of Jesus," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XXXIV (March, 1952), 312-332.

Minear, Paul. "A Note on Luke xxii 36," Novum Testamentum, VII (March, 1964), 128-134.

Moore, George Foot. "Christian Writers on Judaism," Harvard Theological Review, XIV (1921), 197-254.

O'Neill, J. C. "The Six Amen Sayings in Luke," Journal of Theological Studies, n. s. X (April 1959), 1-9.

Robinson, J. A. T. "Elijah, John and Jesus; An Essay in Detection," New Testament Studies, IV (July, 1958), 263-281.

Schubert, Paul. "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, Beihefte 21 (1954), 165-186.

Selwyn, Edward Carus. "The Carefulness of Luke the Prophet," The Expositor, 7th Series, VII (1909), 550-555.

Violet, Bruno. "Zum rechten Verständnis der Nazareth Perikope," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XXXVII (1938), 251-271.